The
FORUM
For March, 1919

PADEREWSKI'S ADVENTURE IN PATRIOTISM

From a Piano Stool to the Premier's Chair

By EDWIN WILDMAN

Editor's Note.—Much of the data herein was obtained direct from the stepson of Mr. Paderewski, Mr. W. O. Gorski, and from Mr. M. Kwapiszewski, the Secretary of the Polish National Committee.

PADEREWSKI'S is the romantic adventure of the upheaval of nations. Known to America as master pianist he charmed the exclusive audiences of the elect; to the public at large his astonishing shock of fuzzy hair symbolized the artist.

Today an ancient nation of wide domain comes knocking at the door of civilization for recognition. It is the Poland of Kosciuszko, and Ignace Jan Paderewski, the long-haired pianist, is its Premier. Its number is thirty-five million souls, long under the iron heel of conquering invaders,—a vast, ancient land, not a century and a half ago larger than Germany by a hundred thousand square miles; a proud land, fallen upon just about the time we were winning our independence, ruthlessly seized; its peoples and its fields parcelled out to the evil Frederick, whom Prussia called "great," to that woman of shrewdness, Maria Theresa, and to a holy Czar of "all the Russias."

Of Poland in the early war days another famous artist of the opera, Mme. Sembrich, said: "The Iron Chariot of War stretches across Europe, one wheel on Belgium, one on Poland." The legions of the Hun swept across the ancient

nation of the Poles and crushed it under the impact of a barbaric war, but the spirit of Kosciuszko lived. It burned in the hearts of its millions. It flamed in the soul of its strong, and out of the throes of war men arose who made its sufferings and wrongs the cause of great nations and its liberties the demand of Peace.

The fight for Poland's freedom was Paderewski's life. To the piano he turned for the expression of his spirit and the large emoluments that he consecrated to the sinews of Poland's voice and the wounds of war. America first knew him in 1889, as a timid youth, a wizard at the piano. Of his first recital a critic chronicled the arrival of a great artist. The public rewarded him with frantic applause. "An intellectual," wrote the critic, "gifted with the power of rousing his audience from a state of calm to wildest frenzy." From his New York debut he traveled across America, the critics always enthusiastic, the audiences of music lovers increasing with his onward triumph, the cartoonists raving with delight at a new subject for their facile pens.

Paris had already proclaimed the new genius of the piano. London had given him approval, but America claimed him, and here in the land of the free he found himself and his hopes for Poland, where as a youth he was proclaimed a genius.

The son of a small property owner of Podolia, the pupil of Professor Roguski, the embryonic head of his beloved country, Paderewski, left his native land at the age of twenty-eight. At forty-nine he has returned to accept the election to the Provisional Presidency conferred upon him from the same room in that gray pile of stone in Warsaw where conspired the Kaiser and his grim Governor General von Baeseler to put a son of the Hohenzollerns on the throne of Poland.

THE BEACON IN PADEREWSKI'S SOUL

THE outbreak of the war found Ignace Jan Paderewski a successful but not a contented man. He was successful with the musical world at his feet. But unhappy because

Poland was in bondage. Son of a Polish commoner, there had been born in him, as in all of his countrymen, the restless craving for the restoration of his country. He wanted Poland free. He was ever in communication, as were all educated Poles each with the other, upon the subject. Letters, conversations, pamphlets passed under the noses of the Russian, German and Austrian secret police. Free Poland! It was a beacon in his soul. In America the movement was definitely crystallized. Mingled with the Relief Societies was the cry of Free Poland! Sembrich, Carnin-Levinski, and Americans of Polish descent united with American sympathizers, and the work of aiding Poland in her suffering and her aspiration progressed.

When war came Paderewski was on his estate, Morges, near Vevey on Lake Geneva, Switzerland. Henryk Sienkiewicz, the novelist, his friend, was in the Grand Hotel at Vevey. Caught in Switzerland by the war, cut off from funds, Polish tourists and artists appealed to Paderewski for aid. He invited them to his home at Morges and when the buildings were filled and still they came he pitched tents on the lawns of his estate and cared for all his countrymen who came. Meanwhile, with Sienkiewicz, he conferred on the problem of relief in Poland. He foresaw the distress which would come as the tide of battle flowed back and forth across his home land—Russians, Germans, Austrians, burning and razing crops and barns as they advanced or fell back. And what would come out of war? Might there not be that chance for which their fathers had taught them to hope—the opportunity to free Poland.

Be ready, thought Paderewski, and arouse the Poles in the yoke of other lands, stir the national sentiment smouldering in the thirty-five million Poles scattered through the domains of the twin Kaisers and Czar. And so there were letters and secret messengers and many other secret activities, all engineered from that neutral clearing-house for intrigue, Switzerland. It began with the relief work.

It was Paderewski's idea that they should organize first to get money into Poland with the permission of interested

governments to relieve the suffering. Sienkiewicz, the novelist, used to walk with Paderewski along the shores of Lake Geneva and they would discuss this plan and what was best to be done. By January, 1915, Paderewski had launched from Switzerland the "General Polish Relief Committee," for the purpose of raising and distributing money in the invaded parts of Poland, through local relief agencies. With the consent of the warring governments in the east these agencies were established throughout Poland generally in charge of ecclesiastics—ministers of Protestantism, Catholic priests and Hebrew rabbis, all being invoked to aid. The Poles will tell you that this organization and its branches was purely a relief proposition, that it did no subterranean work of a political nature. Which is the way a relief organization should comport itself, particularly if it is Polish with a century and a half's oppression ground into its soul! But somehow the Poles were organized; and somehow they were ready when the time came, delegates elected by secret ballot while the Russians and Germans slept, men whom Paderewski knew would contrive to slip across frontiers and report with documents when Poland's day began to dawn. And it came. And in the background there was the great Paderewski, forgetting now his triumphs of the American stage, thinking only of Poland. "How can it be made free?"

CONCEIVING THE RE-BIRTH OF A NATION

WITH the "General Polish Relief Committee" under way in Switzerland, Paderewski hastened to Paris where he opened a second branch; then he crossed the Channel and organized a third branch in London. He of course found many helpers in the two capitals, notorious as they have long been as a haven for political refugees from Russian Poland. In London Paderewski conferred with men who reported to him the sentiment of the Polish people with the outbreak of war, the plans which were in the making, the organization which was being completed not only in Russian Poland but in German Posen, Silesia, West and East Prussia,

in Austrian Galicia in Ruthenia—in all the ancient kingdom's many lands, to unyoke them all and their peoples. Who would have thought that of the Paderewski, whom America knew, the man with the great flowering hair which shook as he played and audiences applauded. Yet here he was conceiving the restoration of a nation's greatness! How absurdly a man's vocation mirrors his inner life!

Paderewski recalled his trip to Australia in 1904, the popularity which was his; and Sidney, with its little Polish colony and Mme. Melba. Surely she would help! So over the cables Paderewski arranged for a third branch of the "General Polish Relief Committee" to be opened in Australia. Then he sailed for the United States. This was in April of 1915.

In New York there was already the Polish-American Relief Committee operating under the auspices of Mme. Sembrich. But Paderewski came fresh from conferences with Poles in Paris, Switzerland and London, men who had sought him out as the man to whom the Polish people looked for leadership, political refugees from Russian Poland, Ruthenia, Lithuania, Posen, Galicia, Silesia. They were men long in touch with the secret political meetings which kept alive the hope of a free Poland in these oppressed lands, men ever in communication with that great mass of thirty-five million Poles whom Russia, Germany and Austria were pitting against each other in war, interfratricidal strife. For the Poles were ever being put in the shock lines of attack—to be killed off. And Paderewski came to America with the voices of his countrymen calling through him for succor.

PADEREWSKI'S MAGICAL INFLUENCE IN AMERICA

THE effect of his appearance in New York in the spring of 1915 was magical upon the Poles in America. They flocked to his standard. The Polish-American Relief Committee merged with his organization, and a fourth branch of the General Polish Relief Committee was opened in New York. He stipulated that these organizations must do no

political work, realizing that, with the United States neutral, such a course would not please Washington. He refused to sanction any propaganda against any of the belligerents, although the temptation to come out openly and attack Germany, Austria and Russia was strong. He laid down a hard and fast law that only relief work be done, the raising of funds to allay the distress in the invaded sections of Poland. The other, the political aspect, could wait. When the day came, the Poles knew that Paderewski was prepared.

Into the relief work he plunged with all his Polish fervor. He himself raised by concerts and addresses $147,000. The total raised in America was $1,200,000. There came a cable from Mme. Melba, from Australia, saying she had raised $13,000 by a concert at Sidney. By the time the United States entered the war, the organization that Paderewski had founded in different parts of the world had raised $4,000,000 for Poland. Paderewski whom we all knew as a volatile, temperamental pianist, became Paderewski the diplomat, waiting for the day when America would go to war, wisely withholding all his political plans until then—plans ever maturing, as here and there a man slipped out of Germany, out of Russia, out of Austria, following tortuous ways to Paris or London or Switzerland, waiting there maturing the plans, keeping in secret communication with the Poles they represented, waiting in these European capitals until Paderewski gave the word from America.

A PIANIST BRANDISHES A SWORD

THE inevitable day came, when America declared war. Twenty-four hours later Americans were astonished to discover Ignace Jan Paderewski in a new rôle—as the leader of a militant Poland. The fuzzy-haired piano-player was brandishing the sword. He had issued a call to the Poles in America to go to war and offered a corps of 100,000 Polish soldiers and 500 Polish officers to the United States Government. He offered to open a recruiting campaign and to train the officers at the Polish School at Cambridge Springs. He

gave the word and the long-suppressed political activities of the organization he had been perfecting burst forth. Germany and Austria were bitterly attacked with facts such as only Poles knew.

Washington declined Paderewski's offer of a corps, fearing that it might create a precedent that naturalized Americans of other European origin would demand the right to go to war under the banner of the "old country." Besides, the "Draft" was coming and America wanted all its naturalized sons in that fine school of Americanization, her army. Thus 220,000 Poles were called to military service under the Stars and Stripes. Nothing daunted, Paderewski sought to help in every way. Did not the crushing of Germany and Austria and the Revolution in Russia mean the supreme opportunity to put Poland back on the map?

There were Poles in America who were not naturalized. Paderewski reached them. He organized thirty thousand of them. He got the consent of Washington to train some of these men at Fort Niagara; and of Ottawa, to train the rest just across Lake Erie at Camp Niagara, on Canadian soil. He went to Washington to try and get this division accepted by the United States army, but being unsuccessful, he at once offered it to France. On June 4, 1917, President Poincaré accepted Paderewski's offer of these thirty thousand troops. They were put into Canadian uniforms and sent to France. Upon their arrival there they donned Polish uniforms and went into a camp for special training, similar to that given the American Expeditionary Forces. On July 14, 1918, they were sent into action near Chateau Thierry, to help check the German onslaught, and fought courageously in that great battle under the French General Arcinard.

It was the first appearance of Polish soldiery on a European battlefield for a hundred and forty-five years. And the man thought of as just a musician, the man whose magic fingers coaxed magic music from a piano, put them there. And when under the Polish eagle these troops of Paderewski faced the Hun, there were Poles all over the world who recalled the prophecy Bismarck made in 1887 in the Reichstag when he

said, " The day the white eagle comes back to life the black eagle will cease to exist." And the millions of Poles in the Central Powers and under their yoke in Russian-Poland, the moment they heard that Poles were fighting under their beloved white eagle on the fields of France, said, " The prophecy of Bismarck has come true. The black eagle of Prussia is doomed! " And being a highly imaginative, excitable people, the Poles took it as an omen and the effect on their morale was tremendous.

OUR STATE DEPARTMENT CALLS THE MUSIC MASTER

BUT this pianist-statesman did not stop. He at once placed himself at the service of Washington. Little did we suspect when, with his eyes ashine with joy in his art, we saw Paderewski acknowledge a salvo of handclapping with the concert-hall bow, that beneath all this musical emotion there was a storehouse of political " information " about Europe. He knew intimately the currents and the cross-currents of eastern Europe, of Germany, Austria, Russia, and the wants of the submerged nationalities behind their frontiers. And time and again the State Department sent for the music-master to get his opinion on this and that phase of European affairs. And all the time Paderewski was getting reports from his agents who were fleeing Russia, Germany and Austria, reporting to Polish delegates already in London and Paris, quickening their plans, as the day on which Paderewski hoped the United States would officially back Poland's aims drew nearer and nearer.

After driving the Russians out of Poland, Germany, on November 5, 1916, indulged in a typical piece of Teutonic political camouflage. The Poles had been waiting for some kind word from the Allies, some political commitment as to their future, but none came. Germany saw the opportunity and issued a " scrap of paper." In Warsaw Governor General Baeseler read to the Poles the German Kaiser's decree for their freedom. The whole purpose of this was to obtain Poles for the armies of the Central Powers, and coincident

with this proclamation the German General Staff shipped to Poland one million and twelve thousand German army uniforms for the Poles who were expected to enlist. The Poles were quick to see through the German trick. They knew German deceit and oppression. They knew that the Kaiser's proclamation of their freedom was not worth the paper it was written on. The men with whom Paderewski was in communication issued warnings that went the length and breadth of Poland. The Poles refused to fight for Germany. They were coerced. They still refused. They were hung, thirty thousand of them. They still refused. The Germans opened the jails and got six hundred and eighty recruits for their army by promising criminals freedom if they would fight. The Germans established the "Council of Regency," under which the Poles were supposed to govern themselves; but under the iron hand of Baeseler it was a sham. The people could not express themselves. The "independence" was a creation of Germany's which made it impossible for the Allies or the United States to recognize "free" Poland. The Poles were shackled by an adroit Wilhelmstrasse trick.

And again it was Paderewski who turned the trick. His plan for a free Poland had the endorsement of President Wilson, and when he came out for a liberated Poland, the die was cast. Paderewski burned the cables to Paris. There came into being, "The Polish National Committee of Paris." It was a body representing Poland with the Allies. It was not a body governing Poland, for that was being done by the iron hand of General von Baeseler under a mock Polish government in Warsaw. But this Paris committee had been organized in such a way that it was able to appear before the diplomatic representatives of the Allies and of the United States and show that it was representative of the wishes of the people of Poland.

THE INTRIGUE FOR LIBERTY

THE story of how this was done is a record of undying hope and the surmounting of the worst obstacles that autocracy could impose. In Paris, London and Switzerland

were these men with whom Paderewski had been in communication pending "the day." They had come from the different sections of Europe where lived Poles—from Austrian Poland, from Posen, Silesia, East and West Prussia in Germany, from Lithuania, Ruthenia and Russian Poland. They had come after they had been secretly elected, despite all the precautions of the German, Austrian and Russian authorities, despite all the watchfulness of the political spies of these nations, despite the military rule. They had come bearing written mandates as to the desires of the Poles whom they represented. They were Roman Demowski, an ex-Deputy of the Russian Duma; Seyda Skirmunt, Piltz, Rozwadowski, Koziski, Wielowiejski, Count Sobanski, Count Zamoyski and Fronczak. They were representative, two noblemen, landholders, the rest of the people sons of the bourgeoisie, of the laboring class, of the farmers, and of the "Intelligenzia" or professional class.

It was a committee organized at the request of the Polish people through their accredited delegates, an extraordinary body representing thirty-five million people cut off from the nations whom they wished to call their Allies by the armed forces of the Central Powers and the Bolsheviki. And there in Paris sat an official Polish body accredited to the Allies and the United States, recognized as representatives and waiting for the day of Polish freedom. It came. It brought the piano-player to Europe.

The scene changes to Warsaw, a picturesque city on the muddy Vistula—a place of great churches with slender spires like minarets and huge cupolas and round roofs, inverted bowls, covered with gold; with its Jerusalamer Allee, that wide pretty boulevard which approaches the river merging into the great Czar Alexander Bridge; its Nowy Swiat, that street named by the Poles to symbolize the New World—hope—the New World where the great Paderewski found fame and wealth. And the little tea-rooms along the Nowy Swiat, the statue of Copernicus, the beautiful old palace that was the Czar's, the gardens, the most modern hotel in the city which Paderewski owns; and as one stands on the high

river bank how wild the sun seems rising over the Russian plains above the squalid housetops of Prague, the Jewish quarter across the river. The tea, the buns, the *bigots* and the fruit wines from the Caucasus one had in Warsaw? Who would have known this Warsaw when the armistice was signed!

In 1916 General Pilsudzki, leader of the Polish Legion of the Austrian army—composed of Austrian Poles who had to serve anyway and to whom Austria cleverly gave the chance to serve in a legion of their own—refused to take an oath of allegiance to the Central Powers. He was jailed. The Legion surrendered, some to the Russians, some to the Italians. The support of the war by Austrian Poles was at an end. With the signing of the armistice General Pilsudzki, released from jail in Austria, came to Warsaw. The German Governor General Baeseler was in flight, fearful of a wrathful populace. The city was in an uproar. The Bolshevists from the east were filtering in. General Pilsudzki established the "Marcazewski government" and made himself a dictator. It was not a representative government. It was composed almost entirely of Socialists. It was drifting to Bolshevism.

"IT IS A GOOD OMEN"

PADEREWSKI saw that the time had come for his presence in Poland. With the support of some four and a half million Poles in the United States; with his name beloved by the Poles of Poland, he communicated with General Pilsudzki and proposed a coalition cabinet composed of representatives of all political parties in Poland. And a few days after the armistice was signed saw the piano-player crossing the Atlantic and conferring with Balfour, and Pinchon of France. President Wilson's support he already had. Backed then by the Allies, Paderewski went to an English port to board the cruiser which was to take him through the Baltic Sea to Dantzig whence he would make his way to Warsaw. It was a perilous trip. Bolshevik assassins waited.

Poland was in an uproar. German agents were active. The Socialists with their Military Dictator had the upper hand. As Paderewski neared the cruiser which was to bear him on his journey, the sun was setting. He saw that the cruiser was covered with seagulls, its hull white with their feathers, and, caught in the level sunlight, saw the ship's name standing out in letters of gold against the white. It was *Concord.*

"It is a good omen," said Paderewski, "there will be harmony."

And there was. Into the uproar of Warsaw he came. Bolshevists threatened him—he was even shot at! Politicians raged at him. Military men tried to dictate to him. But the Polish people were behind him, and Paderewski put through his coalition cabinet. He got a government organized in Warsaw representative of all classes and he emerged as the first Provisional President of Poland. Only the other day his government was recognized by the United States. It is a barrier against Bolshevism. It is an ancient nation brought back to political life. And it was done by a music master—a romance of idealism, in key with the spirit that prompted the entrance of America into the Great War that gave birth to the freedom of Poland.

MUST CONTINUE ALLIED CO-OPERATION

A Striking Argument for the Closer Economic Ties of Nations

By MAJOR WALDORF ASTOR, M. P.

CO-OPERATION between Governments before the war was the exception; it has proved to be the means of victory, and may become the basis of permanent peace. The evils, the irksomeness, the partial failures of inter-Allied co-operation are known, and they may even be intensified in any wider international organization which may prove to be necessary during the coming months. The results of the sudden removal of control, on the other hand, are not known, though they may, to some extent, be anticipated. What would be the position if general relaxation suddenly took place, and if, a few months hence, contracts for the essentials of life, particularly where there is a world scarcity or inability to distribute, were again in the hands of private merchants free to buy against each other in any market and to sell to the highest bidder? The results of too hasty action might be a commercial and social crisis, even in a country so favorably situated as the United Kingdom.

Prices might go up with a rush; in any case there would be wide fluctuations and general uncertainty. It is clear that high prices, unemployment, demobilization of the army, insecurity of trade, restriction of credit, accompanied by anything approaching profiteering on the part of a few middlemen and speculators, would provide all the materials for serious civil commotion.

The effects on Italy, Belgium, and France would be no less disastrous. In the case of neutral countries the too precipitate abolition of inter-Allied control might render it

possible for them to outbid the Allies and to obtain supplies more readily in exporting markets than France, Italy, or Belgium. In order to master the situation the associated Allied countries must be in a position to restrict individual national purchases and to ration these States with necessary supplies so long as there is a shortage. For this purpose the temporary maintenance of some modified inter-Allied or international co-operation seems essential during the transitional period of reconstruction and resettlement.

CAUSES OF THE RISE OF PRICES

ALL the nations of Europe have strained their credit to the uttermost. Money has been lavishly poured out on every sort of engine of destruction, while the machinery of production has not been replaced as in normal times. In every department of production there is urgent need for the application of fresh capital. Europe stands face to face with an enormous war debt, which can only be met by increased production of food, raw material, and manufactured goods, at a moment when the means of production and the means of communication are impoverished to an unprecedented degree. Exchange is on an artificial basis. The currency is inflated, and the necessary new credits for the rehabilitation of industry may involve further inflation. There is everywhere complaint of high prices and of profiteering without consideration of the simple fact that even in England, where an effort has been made as far as possible to meet war costs out of savings, there is an enormous quantity of paper money current, with an extremely limited supply of commodities on which to spend it. Where money has increased faster than production a rise in prices is inevitable.

The process has been carried to its extreme in Russia, where money virtually no longer purchases anything. Recently Swedish ships arrived in Petrograd for the transfer of cargoes of Russian produce for Sweden. They, however, arrived empty, and consequently were obliged to return

empty, as ordinary money transactions were impossible. It was not until they arrived with a load of telephones and other commodities that commercial dealing was feasible. Similarly, the German hopes of importing foodstuffs from the Ukraine were disappointed largely because of the difficulty of doing business by barter. These are extreme cases, but they show that, given a sufficient degree of civil disturbance, a collapse of credit is a real danger.

Before the war Britain was a great creditor nation and by far the greater part of the burden of financing the Allied European armies in the field has been borne by the United Kingdom. This has meant the expenditure and the dissipation of the accumulated wealth of generations. Britain has in great part surrendered her gold, her holdings in foreign railways, mines, estates, and other undertakings, and the State has to some extent mortgaged the earning capacity of its people in the future.

ENGLAND'S WEALTH POURED INTO WAR

UNTIL the entry of the United States into the war it was absolutely necessary for the United Kingdom to maintain solvency in her relations with America. It was to fulfil this necessary condition that British subjects holding securities abroad were asked to place them at the disposal of the Government. The amount of railway and industrial investments in the United States which were returned by British holders to the United States for sale or as collateral security against borrowings amounted to about three billion dollars. Then, too, Britain exported actual gold and bullion to the extent of about 200 million sterling, the greater proportion of this being shipped to the United States in payment of obligations there. Some part of this specie was exported even after the entry of the United States into the war.

The consequence of these transactions is that (1) the gold reserve of the British Treasury and Bank of England (now a little less than 100 million pounds) is about one-sixth

of the gold reserve of the United States, but that (2) the reserves of the two countries would be nearly equal if Britain got back the gold she had parted with during the war and if the United States had not benefited by the gold she received from the Allies. Quite apart therefore from the contribution in man-power which Great Britain has made to the war, she has made further enormous contributions in actual wealth. The war expenditure of the United Kingdom has been about seven millions per day, a sum equivalent roughly to the pre-war estimate of the daily national income. Even allowing for a rise of prices this represents an almost incredible proportion of the national wealth.

The necessity for this gigantic borrowing on the part of the United Kingdom has been due very largely to the obligations incurred in financing her European Allies, for Britain's own war expenditure has been financed, to a considerable extent, out of income. Britain will emerge from the war a very much poorer nation than in 1914 because of help rendered to her Allies. America, on the other hand, will be creditor to the United Kingdom to the extent of nearly 1,000 million pounds. It is true that on the other side of the sheet the European Allies and the Dominions are indebted to the United Kingdom (according to a statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in November last) by something like 1,683 million sterling, but it is perfectly clear that while the Dominions have potential reserves which will in the end enable them to liquidate any obligations they have incurred—totalling £218,000,000—the position of the poorer Allies, including Belgium, make it extremely unlikely that Britain should ask from them in the next few years even the payment of the interest on their war loan. In the case of the 568 million pounds lent to Russia, the prospects of an early recovery are even more remote. The loans to France and Italy total 770 million sterling. Placed in this light the financial situation looks black.

On the other hand, though our balance has been reduced, Great Britain still remains a creditor nation. The pre-war

earning capacity of the United Kingdom was equal to her war expenditure, and there is no reason, if civil peace is assured, why that earning capacity should not be enormously increased in the future by better industrial methods, by more skilful management, by whole-hearted co-operation between employer and employed, by more modern methods of production, and by the economies which the war has shown to be possible in distribution. The experience of the Supply Ministries, especially of the Ministry of Food and the railway service, indicates that economies in this direction are feasible. Then, too, this country has been, on the whole, very much sounder in its war finance than some other belligerents.

WHY SOME COMMODITIES MUST BE CONTROLLED

UNDER what circumstances may it be necessary to maintain for a longer time some international co-operation even after the peace treaty is definitely signed? There might conceivably be two considerations sufficiently cogent to induce a continuance of such organized co-operation for the period of resettlement after the war:—

(1) It may be desirable to give a League of Nations power during the stormy but, it is hoped, limited period that lies ahead to assure the poorer communities of the bare means of existence by maintaining a fair mean price of essentials, and to deal with cases of famine or other calamity. The Hoover Commission in Belgium is the standing example of international assistance provided without waste, with efficiency of distribution, and without the taint of charity.

(2) It may be necessary to secure the world against the limitation of production and the making of excessive profits which is alleged to take place in connection with the management of the great international trusts in private hands.

Probably the only commodity that can be accepted as absolutely necessary to existence in every European country is bread. The citizens of the ideal city of the Republic sat down on the grass to eat of bread and olives, with the occa-

sional addition of cheese, and there are still large communities in Europe which live on a diet not much more varied. To these communities, all of them poor in coin, a rise of ¼d. on the loaf may well mean the difference between sufficiency and semi-starvation, and they cannot be left at the mercy of operators in Chicago or on the River Plate. The British Government went far towards recognizing the hardship involved in a high price for bread by subsidizing the loaf to the extent of some £50,000,000 annually. Yet the burden of an increase in the price of bread falls less heavily on Britain than on other countries where the consumption of other staple foods is less. The consumption figures of wheat of the various countries in normal times are of some interest. Britain's is rather less than one pound a day per head, in France it is 1 2-5 pounds, while in Germany the consumption of wheat and rye together used to be rather more than 1½ pounds. In Italy in the form of bread or macaroni it is probably still greater. During the war wheat control has, in fact, been more extensive than in the case of any other commodity, and the smaller neutrals have, in fact, been purchasing through the organizations of the Wheat Executive in New York, in Argentina, in India, and elsewhere. The length of period during which this organization is to be prolonged requires careful consideration, but it is clear that it cannot immediately be abandoned.

It is therefore conceivable that such a League of Nations as President Wilson and others contemplate, faced with the disruptive tendencies of Europe today, may be compelled to keep control of the supplies of imported wheat until conditions are more settled.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE TRUSTS

IN considering the relation between international control and international trusts, some light will be shed on the situation by considering the activities of the meat trust. This combination began with the control of meat, and later of such

other animal products as hides, bones, and slaughter-house residues, which may fairly be considered as part of the meat trade, but now include in their operations milk, butter, cheese, and poultry. Some of the firms are also to a certain extent concerned in the cereal market and in the refining of cotton-seed oil. It will be seen, therefore, that the Meat Trust may soon be entitled to receive a more general name.

There are indications, too, of a world development of another trading organization dealing in an essential of life—milk. One large firm producing condensed milk have already branches in Switzerland, Britain and the United States. The growth of this organization has been rapid, and should be studied with care in view of the recent growth of combinations of milk traders, to which it might become allied.

The problem in regard to the international control of petroleum supplies presents different difficulties, and no doubt requires a different solution, but here again it is probable that no purely national settlement will meet the case.

In the steel trade, in non-ferrous metals, in chemicals, in soap, and in other trades there was even before the war a growing tendency towards international arrangements between bodies of traders. The war has enormously strengthened the tendency towards national syndication, and a wide extension of international arrangements or trusts appears to be inevitable.

Shipping rings formed the subject of numerous inquiries before the war, but no effective means were devised of preventing secret arrangements between the parties which permitted an effective differentiation of rates. Where the differentiation was not secured by shipping rates only, it could be secured by concessions made by railways. It may be necessary for the League of Nations to consider the whole question of the security of fair dealing at sea, and by river and rail, for all commodities, and to inquire into the working of countries other than the country of their origin.

Peoples may have to choose between the domination of private international trusts and some supervision by an official

international body representative of their respective Governments.

There remains the question of the coming keen competition for markets for manufactured goods during the next few years. This country hitherto has not organized its industries, except in a few cases, on lines designed to face foreign combinations. Britain may have to reconsider the tradition of completely individualist methods in favor of a closer organization of businesses either engaged in the same trade or in closely allied businesses. It may be not altogether a question of choice for trades which aspire to maintain and increase their export. It may be found that it is now no longer possible for individual firms to compete in the world's market on the basis of an individualistic system of keeping their own secrets, maintaining their own channels, and employing their own agents separately both for the purchase of raw materials and the sale of the finished product. The Nottingham lace trade, for example, recently came to the conclusion that they would in future employ only one representative to serve them in South America, and make certain other economies which are only possible in the case of a large number of firms working together. The same tendency is discoverable in other trades, the reason being that many traders feel they are faced with competitors organized in America into enormous combinations, and in Germany into elaborately organized cartels. In Germany some of the cartels have actual State support. Certain other countries are, in fact, organizing their trade in the direction of centralized import and export.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF LABOR CONDITIONS

THE solidarity of labor in the different countries of Europe had been steadily increasing before the war. It might be thought that the immediate result of the war would be to put back the clock in this respect, and to create a gulf between the workers of the belligerent countries. To a certain extent this has inevitably been the case. During the war there

could be, and has been, no direct exchange of views between the working classes of the countries at war with one another, and many of the incidents of the war, notably those in regard to the treatment of the Allied prisoners in enemy countries, and the brutal treatment of the seafaring population, have inevitably alienated sympathy between the masses. At the same time there has been a counter-influence at work, especially on the Continent, the force of which it is at the moment impossible to estimate, but which may prove sufficient to reverse the balance. This counter-influence is the tendency among many workers of all countries to regard themselves as the victims of the war spirit, and therefore as the comrades of the very men with whom they have been fighting. On the whole, it seems probable that the international demands of Labor will not be lessened, but will be increased after the war. Even before the war there was a strong movement for the leveling up of labor conditions in all countries to the same standard, a movement which found support in rather unexpected quarters, since those who asked for a high tariff and for strong measures for the prevention of dumping found themselves in agreement in their aims, though not in the methods advocated, with the extreme Socialists, though on different grounds.

From the purely economic point of view and quite apart from any demand put forward by Labor as such there will be difficulty in applying President Wilson's suggestions that there should be no trade discrimination between associates in a League of Nations if it is going to be possible in the future for one manufacturing country to compete, by the use of juvenile or female labor employed for long shifts and in unhealthy conditions, against another country which has discarded such methods and conditions of labor. Although there is an advantage in well paid and healthy labor, which goes a long way to counterbalance the effect of such competition, the danger exists. On the broadest possible grounds it is necessary that there should be an educated, prosperous working class in every country, and that the factory laws and the conditions of remuneration of all countries should be brought

as nearly as possible to the level of the most progressive member of any League. Even though no economic necessity were evident this demand would inevitably be made by Labor.

ECONOMIC AIM OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

THERE is a whole series of questions connected with justice, trade and the supply of raw material, food, health, transport and postal facilities, labor conditions, and wages, which should be the subject of definite international agreement if the causes of dissension are to be removed. The League of Nations will have an equally great interest in maintaining the standard of health; in securing freedom and rapidity of transport by sea, land, river, and air; in securing fair dealing in trade in the spirit as in the letter; in preventing the exploitation of colored or of juvenile labor with a view to underselling manufacturers in other countries employing well-paid labor. Economically, the aim of a League of Nations must be in the end the elimination of selfish commercial competition between nations. One of the contributory elements in the dissensions which led up to the war was the attitude of the German Government to individual shipping, banking and trading German firms, which were understood to act as the agents and with the full political backing of their Government. Any League of Peace must seek to restrain governments from seeking manifestly unfair commercial advantages for its nationals, whether by secret rebates or other differentiation, by dumping or any other way of evading national obligations. The growth of a higher standard of international commercial honor is essential to any permanent peace, but it can only be gradual. These functions will not be immediately developed. The League of Nations will advance from a simple to a more complex organization as national States have done. But at an early stage it will be forced to deal with some international problems rendered urgent by war conditions. In the forefront of these will be the revictualing of Europe in the widest sense. For this great work of reconstruction basic machinery is provided in the ex-

isting organizations on which the Associated Governments are represented.

The League of Nations will no doubt have a permanent organization in being, under the supervision of which the various judicial and administrative bodies provided for in the peace settlement will conduct their affairs.

THE PESSIMIST

By LEONIE DAVIS COLLISTER

IN the imagined darkness of his trivial hell
He smirched God's heaven with the hands of woe,
He closed his eyes against the comfort of the stars,
With Dantean gloom he robbed the twilight of its glow.

He dragged the funeral garments of a stygian night
Into the songburst of a many-throated dawn,
He barred his soul against the miracle of spring,
Yet sighed to find the daffodils had gone.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

A Statement By The British Government to the Forum

By JOHN LEYLAND

At the request of THE FORUM, *the British Government prepared a statement on the much mooted subject, "The Freedom of the Seas," written by John Leyland, a well known naval expert publicist employed by the British Admiralty.*

SOME people seem to discover a curious antithesis between President Wilson's claim for the Freedom of the Seas and the strong support given to Mr. Josephus Daniels' proposal to prosecute a large naval scheme for at least three years, which according to Rear Admiral Badger will be the beginning of a program which will make the United States Navy equal to the most powerful navy maintained by any nation in the world.

In reality there is nothing contradictory between the projected Freedom of the Seas and the creation of such a navy, because it is quite certain that the intended League of Nations will employ against any offending state exactly the same blockading measures as the British and American navies, acting together, have employed ever since the United States came into the war.

However much the United States may have criticised or opposed the point of view of the British Navy, the necessities of the war soon brought reasonable American opinion round to the British standpoint.

The situation is quite clear and beyond question. All that has been done has been to prevent as far as possible any neutral power from giving support to the enemy. The German claim for "Freedom of the Seas" was that this neutral traffic should continue untrammelled. This is an old controversy. The neutral never willingly sees his commercial interests threatened by the belligerents, and the most powerful belligerent never permits, if he can help it, anyone to assist

his enemy. At the Peace Conference, or subsequently, the allied belligerent powers will settle this matter among themselves, and the German claim that a course should be pursued at sea which is never allowed on land will certainly not obtain hearing.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENT FOR THE PRINCIPLE

IN the Political Testament of Richelieu, England appears as the tyrant of the seas. After the Seven Years' War her evil repute among the neutrals increased. The French Monarchy gladly welcomed the assistance of the Neutral Powers against British sea supremacy in the Armed Neutrality of 1780, and Napoleon was the practical organizer of the Armed Neutrality of 1800. In the Treaty of Tilsit, 1807, we were denounced again as wrongdoers at sea. The United States in the Treaty of 1785 with Prussia demanded the immunity of private property at sea. During the French Revolutionary War, while our practice was tolerated, the Americans did not relinquish the principle, and interference with American shipping practically led to the war of 1812.

The phrase, "Freedom of the Seas," has in reality nothing German about it. It originated with the Dutch and the French, and the expression, "Empire des Mers," was often on Napoleon's lips. The legal aspect of the question cannot be discussed here. But the practice of blockade and the suppression of neutral supplies to the enemy has continued with increased effect since the Americans came into the war. Whatever interpretations therefore be set upon the Freedom of the Seas it can imply nothing different from the means employed by the Allied Navies during the war.

The Americans are a practical and logical people, and though nearly every American President from Washington downward has enforced the neutral point of view, the belligerent's practice was employed during the Civil War as in the war which is now drawing to its close. It is quite clear from the features of the United States naval program that President Wilson can intend nothing antagonistic to the mainte-

nance of such navies as are required by great maritime Powers. That is the British point of view also.

The League of Nations has yet to come into being, and years may elapse before it becomes organic and practical. Nothing, therefore, is likely to be changed in the policy of the nations, and President Wilson's hope of disarmament will have to be regarded in the light of each nation's responsibilities. There is ample time—not, perhaps, at the Peace Conference, but at subsequent discussions among the Powers—to settle points arising from the multitude of economic questions which may be grouped under the proposed Freedom of the Seas, such as embargo, coastwise navigation, the use of the Suez, Kiel and Panama Canals, and perhaps protection and free trade.

On one point there may be some assurance of certainty. It is that the good understanding will continue which now exists. There is a sincere intention, both in England and the United States, that they should work in co-operation for the good of the world and the liberties of the peoples. War never leaves nations where it finds them, and the Government of the United States will inevitably adopt and make its own the British point of view on the "Freedom of the Seas."

NATIONAL EDUCATION AND ITS PILOT

What the Federal Government Under the Leadership of Senator Hoke Smith is Doing to Annihilate Ignorance

By AARON HARDY ULM

THIS year the National Government will spend millions on popular education. Most of it will be spent through machinery provided and controlled by the States. Virtually every dollar must be matched by another dollar from the States or other sources; in fact, every such dollar will be more than duplicated. Next year the amounts given by the general Government will increase automatically, and again the next year and for several thereafter. And the increases must be duplicated. The Government stands committed in perpetuity to the program of education so far adopted as much as to paying interest on the funded debt, and the program will be enlarged. It is not extravagant to predict that within a few years the Federal Government will be spending hundreds of millions of dollars to the end that illiteracy be made impossible and every child in America be given opportunity for acquiring skill in some kind of profitable and congenial work. Some of the bills providing further extensions will be passed before this is printed if Congress finds time at the present session to vote upon them. They, with what has been done, cover a scheme of Americanization, via education and vocational training, through huge Federal subsidies.

True national aid to education is a development of recent times and was made largely through the legislative endeavors of Hoke Smith, United States Senator from Georgia. Others contributed thought, agitation, leadership and votes, but the educational program of the United States Government, as that program stands today is—more than anyone

else's—Hoke Smith's program. He originated and conducted the inquiries, drew the bills and led the fights for the appropriations.

IDEA ORIGINATED WITH JEFFERSON

WHAT the Government is doing and proposes to do for education can be best illustrated by telling of what was done in the past, say, up to 1911, when Hoke Smith entered the United States Senate. Its contributions, in actual cash, consisted then almost solely of modest subsidies for the so-called land-grant colleges. Those subsidies began in 1862 and were the offshoot of an idea originating with Thomas Jefferson.

Jefferson proposed, when the new territories inherited or acquired by the original thirteen States were surveyed for sale or division, that certain parts of the lands be reserved for the support of State universities and public schools. Thereby was established, without cost, great endowments for education. The endowments were added to from time to time, and they account for the rapid development of universities and public schools in many of the States. But the aid took no money out of the Treasury and was restricted largely to new communities.

Later it was recognized that all the States were entitled to share, in part, money procured from the sale of lands which all had fought or paid to secure. The Morrill Act, as approved in 1862 by President Lincoln, provided for the distribution of certain land funds among all the States to provide for mechanical and agricultural education. The amounts received by the States, never large, were finally put in the form of an annual appropriation of $50,000 to each State. For many years the States operated theoretical agricultural or mechanical schools, usually as departments in their universities, and went ahead and spent the Federal revenues on all kinds of education. Finally the University of Wisconsin led the way in showing how scientific agriculture could be taught. Others fell in line, with the result that real agricul-

tural schools, along with technological schools, came into being throughout the country. This development, of the last few decades, came about without special prodding or additional assistance from Congress.

Thus the situation stood as recently as eight years ago, with educators and students lamenting the shameful fact that the United States lagged behind every country of western Europe in the field of vocational education.

Meantime, Congress had provided funds for the conduct of agricultural experiment stations in each of the States and established in Washington a Bureau of Education, which then as now possessed little in the way of funds or authority.

Everybody realized and had long realized that much more needed to be done. In fact, all three big political parties of that time declared, in 1912, for liberal Federal aid to vocational education. The movement awaited, as it had long awaited, some one man to get and keep it going along the turgid channels of legislation.

SENATOR HOKE SMITH BUILDS AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

WHEN the Democrats organized the Senate in 1913 Hoke Smith became chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, a post he has held for six years. He set to work building a genuine National program of education, based on liberal aid from the Federal Treasury. And a big part of his time, despite many other activities, has been given to that work.

During the preceding administration Senator Smith brought about the creation of a Bureau of Markets in the Department of Agriculture. That Bureau has grown into the largest one in the Department. While it is not directly an educational venture, it jibes beautifully with the educational program as later devised, as does also Federal aid to good roads which Smith helped bring about though he did not originate.

Early in the first Wilson administration Senator Hoke

Smith prepared and brought about the passage of a bill providing for agricultural extension work on a National scale. Of all domestic measures enacted by Congress in recent years that Act has probably procured greatest results along constructive lines. The Act is known as the Smith-Lever bill, Congressman Lever, of South Carolina, having piloted it through the House. Its work in taking the agricultural colleges and experiment stations and the Federal and various State Departments of Agriculture directly to the farms will be briefly sketched.

No matter how efficient the agricultural colleges may be, under the old system they could reach only a small portion of the farming population. The son of the well-to-do planter who returned home with his agricultural degree helped all the surrounding country by the improved agricultural practice he put into effect. Literature was circulated and speakers went forth to country fairs and such to expound the theories of scientific farming. The Departments agitated and pleaded, but their advice went over the heads of all but a small per cent of the nation's 12,000,000 farmers. The process of improving farming practice and raising the per acre yield throughout the country was terribly slow and tedious.

The Smith-Lever bill made it possible to place, through machinery established and controlled by the States, trained farm and home economic demonstrators into the thousands of farming communities in the country. Demonstrators now work in virtually every farming county in the country, for each State has accepted the terms of the Smith-Lever bill, which provides that the States must duplicate every dollar supplied from the National coffers. In fact, they do more than that.

TEACHING FARM ECONOMICS

THOSE farm extension agents, in co-operation with farmers, supervise the planting and cultivation of specific acres, whereon they apply the newest scientific methods for

the education of farmers all around. The home economics workers proceed along similar lines, but mostly through clubs and community centres in teaching women and girls the latest about canning, drying, cooking, preserving and household management. Each is an expert adviser and a human link in a chain that joins virtually every American farmer, and his wife and children, to all existing specialized knowledge bearing on their occupational welfare.

President Wilson has described the agricultural extension service inaugurated by the Smith-Lever Act as "the greatest practical and scientific agricultural organization in the world." Secretary Houston says in his last annual report: "It has become increasingly clear that no more important piece of educational extension machinery has ever been created."

The regular appropriation for the work amounts at present to about $3,000,000. War emergency legislation added temporarily about $4,000,000, but allowances from other sources—States, counties, communities—have been so liberal that approximately $15,000,000 will be expended this year in taking scientific knowledge to the farm. The regular Congressional appropriation increases automatically each year and will continue to do so until it reaches nearly $5,000,000 and will go on in perpetuity, subject only to enlargement.

Farm extension already has increased production per acre and in time, with other help, will double it. It has raised the quality of agricultural products and has promoted conservation practices worth millions. It increases the happiness and contentment of farm life, which it seeks to raise to its true intellectual sphere. Despite war's drain of man power from the farms, lowered quality of fertilizers, scarcity and increased cost of seed and implements, it was a big factor in enabling agricultural America to rise to war's big demands, feed ourselves, in big part our Allies, and enter Peace with such an abundance that the potent agricultural problem right now is essentially one of distribution.

SCOPE OF FARM EXTENSION SERVICE

ON July 1, 1918, there were 6,216 extension workers, including 3,001 county agents, 2,034 home demonstration agents and 1,181 boys' and girls' club workers, omitting an enumeration of specialists, directors, supervisors, etc. More than 1,000,000 farmers belong to organizations formed to assist the county agents in their work. A million or more women belong to community clubs or centres organized by the home demonstration agents. Home economic agents supervised the putting up of 35,000,000 cans of vegetables in the South alone last year. There are more than 2,000,000 juveniles participating in the thousands of competing corn, pig, poultry and other clubs promoted for the benefit and training of children. The products raised by the members of those clubs are worth millions of dollars. One group alone last year reported more than a million dollars' worth of vegetables grown in home gardens.

The country, the villages, and on a smaller scale the suburbs and on a slight scale the cities, have been organized into institutes, community clubs or centers, wherein there is mingled competition and co-operation, all working under expert guidance to increase and improve the productive capacity of each individual and of the nation. Certainly that phase of American life threatens no Bolshevism!

If the writer may wander afield for the moment and aim his pen at a threatened social tangle, let him suggest that those who fear Bolshevism's coming contrast the I. W. W. and other extreme socialistic or anarchistic organizations with the far stronger, more general and representative—and unsung—organizations like those begotten by agricultural extension—and the contrast will dissipate all serious fears.

The agricultural extension act reaches directly only the farming element. There are millions in industry equally entitled to aid from the Government. They are receiving it, or are pledged to receive it, on a scale even bigger than agricultural extension. It is to be provided through an act that

also was initiated and passed at the instance of Senator Hoke Smith. It provides a Federal subsidy that will increase automatically until it reaches a total of approximately $7,000,000, for general vocational education, and as with other like appropriations virtually every dollar must be duplicated. The fund will be expended by State authorities. The plans will come from the State authorities in each State, but require approval by the Federal Board for Vocational Education before the Federal fund goes to the State, and the machinery of execution is left in control of the States. An allotment can be withheld only by approval of Congress. The fund is divided between teaching agriculture, the trades of industry, home economics, and for training persons to teach all those vocations. This act will put us on a par with western Europe in training youths for occupations; for the seed sown by Congress will fruit ultimately, as experience shows, into annual expenditures of tens of millions.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF THE DISABLED

AROUND the vocational education machinery, there was built the plan for vocational rehabilitation of soldiers disabled in the war, another measure sponsored by Senator Hoke Smith. Ample funds are provided not only for re-educating every soldier unable by reason of disability to follow his old occupation, but also for helping each to get and hold a new job. Already some 20,000 have applied for the benefits of the Act.

Another Hoke Smith bill, along the vocational line, provides funds for the vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry. The number is said to amount to about 750,000 a year. The measure as drawn gives an all-inclusive meaning to "industry." It would include the farmer permanently disabled in being thrown from his horse or the hobo whose trespassing foot is crushed between the "bumpers," as well as the mechanic who loses his hand or the fireman whom a wreck leaves unfitted for muscular work. The scheme is not predicated on individual deserts, but on the economical

necessity for society seeing to it that all its members are fitted to earn a livelihood. And it is proven that none, no matter how badly disabled in a physical sense, are beyond vocational rehabilitation. Not one voice was raised in opposition at the recent committee hearing on this bill, which will pass when voted upon.

Another contribution to general education prompted by Senator Smith is a provision written on his suggestion into the standing military law providing that enlisted soldiers in the regular army be educated along vocational lines, including the industrial trades and farming. War has prevented general application of the measure but since the armistice encouraging experiments have been made, notably by General Leonard Wood at Camp Funston.

Other Smith measures awaiting enactment, and which almost certainly will be passed when reached, set aside several millions of Federal funds for seeing to it that every citizen or his children is taught to speak, read and write the English language. Those bills would wipe out the barriers in the way of Americanizing recalcitrant elements in our foreign population and would extinguish illiteracy among the natives.

A further measure of big industrial importance provides funds for setting up industrial experiment stations in each of the States, the same to be patterned after the agricultural stations, and conducted under the general supervision of the Federal Bureau of Standards, but controlled by the States.

NATIONAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION WANTED

BUT the complete fruition of the big national program of education as visioned by Hoke Smith and his co-laborers awaits the creation of a National Department of Education with a cabinet member at its head. A bill so providing is now pending and will be pushed to passage, which is unlikely to be long deferred. The measure as it stands sets aside $100,000,000 of Federal funds for the support of common schools.

"There is some objection to direct Federal financial aid on a huge scale for the common schools," says Senator Hoke

Smith. "The objection predicated on community or sectional selfishness. It is an attenuation of the old protest against taxing the man of means for the education of the children of his less fortunate neighbor. The immense wealth in the big centers of population was not created in those communities. It came from all the country and should be made to help educate all the country. Just as the man of wealth has found that he has a vital interest, beyond any philanthropic impulse, in the education of his neighbor's children, so does New York, Boston or Chicago have a vital interest in seeing that the children of poverty-stricken Podunk or Dark Corner are prepared for sustaining and producing citizenship. Therefore, the Federal Government can no longer properly refrain from giving liberal direct support to the common schools.

"What we need and are developing is a truly constructive plan of real National contribution to education, without infringing on State and local management of the schools. No appropriations made by Congress have been so productive of additions from other sources as those made to education. They are not only duplicated, when such is required, but the rule is to increase the duplication far beyond the requirement. Funds given for the support of the land-grant colleges are duplicated many times.

"It shouldn't be made the function of the Federal Government to support, by direct appropriation from its Treasury, so-called 'higher' literary education. That will take care of itself provided adequate facilities for primary and intermediate education are established and maintained."

With Hoke Smith, education is a hobby, education along vocational lines a special hobby. He himself never went to college. He was educated by his father, Dr. H. H. Smith, some time of the University of North Carolina and for long a representative of the Peabody Fund in the South. Dr. Smith was one of the first scholars of his day. He was so devoted to scholarship for its own sake that he never, of course, accumulated much money.

His son, the present Senator, taught school while studying law. While in his thirties he served in the cabinet of President Cleveland, later became twice Governor of Georgia, from which office he went to the Senate. The only other public positions he ever held were the presidencies of the Young Men's Library Association and the Board of Education of his home city, Atlanta. And of all he is perhaps proudest of his work in those two, particularly in that of the local educational board to which he gave about twenty years as chairman.

Naturally, he has his political critics, and many persons, this writer among them, have not approved all his political tenets which have ranged widely the field of public questions. But political critics have ever agreed with his political advocates on one phase of his public life, that having to do with education. They join in saying that his approach to educational subjects has been along the line of true statesmanship, and guided by a vision extraordinary in bigness, insight and practicality.

EDUCATION PRODUCES WEALTH

"EDUCATION is no longer a matter of philanthropy, of charity, or a purely local or sectional question," said Senator Smith to the writer. "It is good business more than good philanthropy. It is preparedness for war as well as peace. Money intelligently spent in training people to do better and more productive work is the one investment bound to earn ten-fold and even a hundred-fold. It produces wealth. It develops citizens.

"Our people have the best surroundings the world affords, and the best opportunities. We must give them an educational system just as nearly perfect as human mind and money can produce, so they may become as productive as possible through being given special skill in various lines of production. We should lead the world not only in production per man but per acre as well.

"If you wish to guard against discontent, you must

satisfy the aspirations of the people. If you are to have a happy people, it doesn't make much difference how much wealth or how little they possess, or what kind of work they do—you must see that they are fitted to apply the touch of the artist to whatever they do. There is no satisfaction like doing something well. If I were a capable carpenter, I would get as much joy from working with wood as I get from trying cases in court.

"We should make our people realize that education begins at the cradle and should not stop until the individual reaches the grave. The desire to improve and the facility and incentive to steadily better that which we do bring a satisfaction and a compensation that no product of idleness or inefficiency, however gilded by wealth or luxury, can give.

WHAT THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT DOES

"THEREFORE, the Congressional enactments I have had a hand in passing aim at helping as many as possible become better and more joyful workers. The vocational education act, for instance, sets to work a process by which the teacher of the primary grades in our public schools will be led to study her pupils, get a vision of the future of each one and steer all toward the career in which most enjoyment will be found. Then the schools will afford special training for those careers; I mean the public schools and high schools as well as the colleges that will finish up the higher experts and specialists.

"There is no work, no matter how lowly or commonplace, which cannot be raised to an art as pure and appealing as the painting of pictures or the manipulation of a violin. All that is necessary to make it so is for the person pursuing it to want to do it above all other work and to possess the knowledge and trained skill needed for doing the work in the very best way.

"Providing national aid for education doesn't tend to centralize Government or bring within the Federal power control of any of those things rightfully belonging to the

States or smaller governmental units. The aid given and proposed consists substantially of subsidies that may be accepted or let alone. The strings attached to those gifts are not arbitrary and aim only at seeing that the funds are employed, as intended, in stimulating as fully as possible particular forms of general education. For example, the big appropriations distinctly provide that none of the funds be used in purchasing land or erecting buildings. Such equipment must be provided from other sources. Congress isn't interested in educational plants, but only in the individual. It wants to help, not control. It reserves to the Federal Government the right to pass on plans. But none of the legislation contemplates transferring any responsibility from the States to the Nation. The State authorities present the plans and administer them.

"The fight for further national aid to education will go on. Such bills that are still pending and which are not passed by the present Congress will be renewed as soon as the new Congress meets.

"There is still much to be done, and it will be done. The war has shown us how rich we are and how enterprising. The time will come and come soon when no comparison of education of any kind in the United States with that of any other country in the world will be other than creditable to America."

THE SCARLET THREAD

By DANIEL HENDERSON

"Behold, when we come to the land, thou shalt bind this line of scarlet thread in the window which thou hast let us down by."—JOSHUA 2:18.

RED as the lips of Rahab,
Harlot of Jericho,
Hung the thread from her casement
Ages on ages ago.

Over the fire and slaughter
Shone the cord's rich flame:
Out of her ruined city
Rahab, the shielded, came!

* * *

Swiftly the spinners of evil
Gathered the thread and spun;
Nightly robed in its color,
Daughters of Babylon!

* * *

How its riotous tangles
Twisted dancer and priest!
Twined the groves of Astarte!
Girded the emperor's feast!

* * *

Solomon, from his window
Watching Jerusalem,
Mused on the subtle woman
Flaunting her scarlet hem!

* * *

Men go marching to battle:
Suddenly flares from a door—
Deadlier than their foemen—
Crimson that Rahab wore!

Yea, and the spindles that fashioned
  Nineveh's red attire
Spun for our present cities
  The halter of desire!

Then is the thread so woven
  Into the web of the race
That, age through age, we must bear it
  Down to the Judgment-place?

When will our spirits sicken
  Of weaving the cloth of doom?
When will the God within us
  Shatter its shuttle and loom?

MILITARISM IN A LEAGUE OF NATIONS?

An International Superstate Resting Upon Prussian Force

By Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH
[UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM IDAHO]

AT the time that the League to Enforce Peace was first organized in Philadelphia in 1918 it was apparent to those who gave it consideration that it must rest ultimately upon force, upon the principle of repression. Naturally, the first question was, "How are you going to raise your army to sustain this vast military program or this league based upon force?" Would the citizens of the United States volunteer to enter the army for the purpose, for instance, of settling difficulties in the Balkans? Would the American boys leave their homes or the farms or the factories for the purpose of taking part in the adjustment of a controversy between Japan and Russia over Manchuria? How are you to have a sufficient force in a free nation with which to maintain the program outlined by this league?

After some delay ex-President Taft was frank enough to say precisely how it was expected to raise and maintain a sufficient army to support a league to enforce peace. I call attention to this because it is one of the practical features now indicated in the workings of this program; it is one of the things which come home direct to the citizen, and which enables him to see precisely what his duties and obligations are to be if this particular principle should be incorporated in the League of Nations. We are to have conscription in time of peace. We yielded to the principle of conscription in the great emergency through which we have just passed, but it is certainly of extraordinary moment to the people of this country to have presented to them the question of conscription in time

of peace in order to secure a force with which to sustain the proposed league.

We shall never be able to call into activity or into service a sufficient force from the American homes to do our part in a league of nations—to settle the controversies of Europe and of Asia by means of military power, except by fastening conscription upon the American people. At a time when other Governments, which have had experience with conscription, are pledging the people that it shall be abrogated and eliminated from their system this Republic is to have it made permanent. While others are trying to get away from it the League to Enforce Peace would require that we ingraft it upon our system as an abiding principle. Lloyd-George and others who have spoken upon the subject have said that it shall not only be eliminated, but that it shall be forgotten as a precedent. The League to Enforce Peace states that the basis upon which it expects to operate is that of inaugurating this principle even in time of peace. That is the practical, and the first practical, proposition with which we shall have to do in the organizing of this particular form of a league. I think it well to quote a paragraph from Mr. Lloyd-George's speech about the time that he was asking the people of England for their suffrages:

> "On the eve of this important election which means so much to the country I wish to make it clear beyond all doubt that I stand for the abolition of conscript armies in all lands. Without that the peace conference would be a failure and a sham. These great military machines are responsible for the agony the world has passed through, and it would be a poor ending to any peace conference that allowed them to continue."

That which the Premier of England looks upon as the basis of militarism and the exclusion of which is essential to the peace of the world, ex-President Taft regards as indispensable to the successful operation of a league to enforce peace. Both are correct, and, peculiarly enough, both are for a league of nations.

WE ARE PREPARING FOR WAR UPON A GIGANTIC SCALE

WE pass on to another feature of this program of a league to enforce peace. We are not only to have an army based upon conscription but we are to have the largest navy in the world. Admiral Badger, appearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs, outlined the navy we should have, and frankly stated the objects and the purposes for which it was being built.

> "Navies must be the principal support of a league of nations, and the United States, from its wealth, influence, and power, will be called upon to contribute a very large share of the international police force to render such a league effective."

The able Secretary of the Navy, addressing the committee a few days afterwards, among other things said:

> "It is desired to enter the Paris peace conference with the assurance from Congress that the American Navy would be enlarged to a size commensurate with the greatest naval power."

Why should we enter a peace conference at which no one will have a seat other than our friends and our allies with the assurance from the American Congress that we are building the biggest war machine in history? If I meet with my neighbor to settle a difficulty, announcing in advance that we are there for the purpose of arranging our difficulties upon peaceful terms and in a peaceful way, it is calculated to disturb the serenity of the gathering if I throw upon the table my loaded revolver. There is no one at the peace table to whom it is necessary to say that we are preparing for war upon a gigantic scale. I have no particular objection to the game of international bluff, provided it is not too expensive for the taxpayers. Besides, the bluff might be called, and that would be the beginning of another war.

Again he states:

> "I may say that you can not do anything in the world which would so strengthen this country's position at the peace conference as to authorize this enlarged naval program."

I quote from a report of his testimony in the New York *Times* of December 31:

> "It is the desire of Secretary Daniels and the Navy officials to have a Navy which will be as large as that of any other country, not only for defensive purposes but for policing the world in case a league of nations to enforce peace is created at the Versailles conference."

This program is estimated to cost $600,000,000. This is the largest single naval expenditure in the history of the world, all in order that a league to enforce peace may not fail for want of respectability. But to put out this extraordinary and bewildering and threatening program at this time is unnecessary to the situation, unwise as an international move, and highly unjust to the taxpayers of this country, already harried and worried with the fearful burdens of the war.

SHAMELESS ORGY OF EXPENDITURE

AFTER the war has come to an end, with our enemies defeated and all the great naval powers friendlier than ever before in our history, we propose to spend $600,000,000 in the next three years upon a powerful fighting machine. Is this not a direct challenge to the good faith of our allies, or does it not throw doubt upon the sincerity of our own professions? Above all, is it not a signal act of injustice to the people of this country, who have paid taxes and bought Liberty Bonds and saved and stinted and denied themselves in this crisis? Is the American taxpayer to have no place whatever in this program of national affairs save that of a coddled peon? Are we going on with this shameless orgy of expenditure until the people are forced to cry out with the voice of revolution against the madness that is grinding them to powder? The expenditures of this war will amount to easily thirty billions, and yet we are proposing to add billions upon billions for war purposes in time of peace.

Then there comes from the War Department a demand for the purchase of all the cantonments. These vast war utilities are to be purchased at a cost of from twelve to fifteen millions and to be maintained and kept up at a cost annually of from fifteen to twenty million dollars. These things are

the first incidents or preliminary preparations of the League to Enforce Peace. These are the modest preparations for peace by repression, by force. While we seem to have great plans in theory, nevertheless in practice we are still apparently following the rule of kings and autocrats, and that is to first frighten the people and then rob them through taxation.

Now, let us see what they propose to do with that great military force when they get it. We are not left in doubt in regard to it. The whole scheme is founded on force. These advocates of this particular league can find no amelioration, no remedy, save that based upon force. "Kill them off!" cries the league's most distinguished exponent. While yet in the formative period, even before they have an army at their command, before they have actually tasted the power for which they hunger, the watchword is, "Kill them off!" What will be the program when once power is lodged in their hands? "He tasted blood and felt no loathing. He tasted again and liked it well." That is the story of all individuals and of all institutions believing in or founded upon the gospel of force. If these people would enter Russia, with whom we are at peace, and slay and decimate because of internal troubles, what would they do with other nations which might from time to time have internal disturbance or revolutions? Have they not said in explicit language that "We want a force to deal with small nations when they start a conflagration." Are all conflagrations to be put out save those which meet with their approval? The fathers started a conflagration in 1776. Other peoples may start conflagrations of the same kind. India, with her countless millions, may in future years express a desire for independence and for freedom. Other subject nationalities may feel some time or other that they want their independence and freedom. What will be the doctrine of the league? They have announced it—"Kill them off!"

IS THERE NO PEACE?

THE people have been told of the halcyon days that were to come with the league. Men would no longer make war. The crushing burdens of stupendous armaments were to be

lifted. The dull, monotonous struggle of the masses bending under the weight of governmental expenditures was to have an end. But not so. We are to have a larger standing army than ever. Why? In order to support the league. We are to have the largest navy in the world. Why? In order to support the league of peace. We are to compose all the troubles and put out all the conflagrations started to destroy kingship or bureaucracy. And how are we to stop the troubles? How are we to put out the conflagrations? Why, in the same old way; nothing new about it at all. Precisely the same way and in the same method of the Holy Alliance—"kill them off!"

If the people are to be taxed and taxed, and if they rebel against the burden are to be killed off, I do not see the virtue of the scheme. I confess that my vision may be somewhat blurred and I know my fancy is somewhat troubled when I see these vast equipments of war, this vast array of force, standing armies, conscription, great navies, and taxes without stint or limit, with no answer to give the people when they cry out in resistance save the cry coming down through the centuries from the lips of tyrants and despots, "Kill them off!"

You cannot establish peace by force, by repression. If you have any other workable scheme or plan, bring it forward, but the scheme based on force is more repulsive and destructive of human justice and human liberty and human progress than Prussianism itself. It is Prussianism extended, amplified, and denationalized. If you think you can seek out and do justice to all nations, great and small; if you think you can found an organization based upon the principles of human progress and whose decrees are enforced by public opinion; if you think you can prescribe reasonable rules for change and growth and progress; if you think you can look into the hearts of a particular people and interpret that inexplicable passion which when the appointed hour comes melts away all obstacles, rejects all restraints, and forces its way from a small to a great nation; if you think you can look upon a French revolution cursed with apparent stupidity, and

steeped in blood and foretell that in a hundred years those same people, disenthralled and free, will stand between civilization and organized barbarism as the French stood at the Marne; if you think you can now look upon a broken and dismembered and bleeding Russia and foretell her future or point out along what paths she will move in order that she may realize the best there is in her; if you think you can do what the living God has not been able to do—standardize the human family; if you feel you can undo what He in His inscrutable wisdom did when He planted race prejudice in the hearts and stamped color upon the faces of men—then give us your prospectus. We will be glad to look it over. We shall be infinitely happy if we find that it is workable. But if you are simply going back to the old discarded league of military power with which to put out conflagrations, to repress movements, and to kill off those who are dissatisfied and who in their madness and helplessness are striving for better things, we should reject it and denounce it as a menace to human liberty and a challenge to human progress.

FUTURE FILLED WITH FOREBODINGS

IT is likely true that the next war will not be a war between governments or between nations, but between the governments and the people. I admit that the future is filled with many forebodings, but they are of internal conflicts. Those of us who believe in an orderly, regulated liberty, in a government of law, a government by the people in orderly and manly fashion, have something of a task before us. I deplore the madness and the fearful crimes of Russia, but we must find some remedy besides killing them off. I am one of those who believe that the French Revolution or the Russian Revolution, that Robespierre and Lenine, are the legitimate outgrowth and offspring of the injustice and oppression, the hideous, prolonged, and insistent cruelty of the governments which preceded. There has not been a mass movement in all history that did not have a just foundation. We might have differed wholly with the methods, we might have deplored

the madness, but there was a cause for it, nevertheless, lying back. There has not been a crime committed in Russia in the last six months that had not its legitimate parent crime in the indescribable oppression of the bloody Romanoffs for the last two and one-half centuries.

Now, we cannot shoot up or kill that kind of movement. If we are not strong enough and wise enough to remove the injustices and the wrongs, to restore security and confidence to the people, then these things will have to work themselves out in blindness and in wrath and in destruction. You have got to feed the Russian people on something besides bullets. That is the food which the Romanoffs have fed them for the last three centuries. America should adopt a different plan. You have got to remove the causes of disturbances or the disturbance will go on, for starving people are not afraid to die at the cannon's mouth. It is natural, therefore, that the ex-President, entertaining the views he does, advocates a league which will not only determine controversies between different nations, but which will go into Russia, which will go into this country and into that country, and adjust the internal affairs of that particular nation in accordance with the program of the league.

But summing it all up, the views of the ex-President, the platform of the league, the constructions placed upon the platform by its authors and by those who are in sympathy with it, here is what the League to Enforce Peace proposes: Conscription in time of peace and a large standing army; the greatest navy in the world; adding by the navy alone to our great tax burdens from two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars a year; the transferring, if not legally, in effect, the power to declare war from the Congress of the United States to some tribunal over which the people themselves, who must fight the battles and pay the taxes, have no control; the renouncing of the doctrine of Washington and the entering of the politics and alliances of Europe; becoming a member of a league from which we cannot withdraw; the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine and permitting Europe to interfere in the affairs of the Western Continent; the send-

ing of American soldiers to Europe and Asia and Africa whenever any disturbance arises, although it may not affect our people at all; and the whole scheme has just one ultimate power, and that is military force—the same power and the same principle which every despot has relied upon in his efforts against the people when the people were seeking greater liberty and greater freedom, the same power which George III. and Wilhelm II. made the basis of their infamous designs. That is the program to be given to the American people under the soporific term of a league to enforce peace.

ARE WE YIELDING TO EVIL OLD-WORLD FORCES?

THE fact is we have come in contact with two evil forces from the Old World—Prussianism and internationalism. Instead of repelling and rejecting them we are yielding to their slimy maw the proudest heritage ever left to the keeping of any people—American principles and the American conception of government. One's two hands are not more alike than, in the last analysis, are the doctrines of Lenine and Trotsky and that of Wilhelm and Ludendorff. Both contemplate world dominion and the utter destruction of the national spirit everywhere. Each would undermine and destroy the individuality of all governments and compound all under the universal rule. Both are founded upon treachery, deceit, lying, repression, force, decimation, and assassination. They came together at Brest as naturally and as inevitably as common criminals combine to stay the hand of the law. They were both against America and everything for which America stands. But while civilization starts back in shuddering contemplation of the rule of either, certain American statesmen propose to take something from the creed of both and substitute it for the teachings of Washington and the faith of millions of American homes. Instead of our own government, controlled and directed by the intelligence and patriotism of our own people; instead of American standards and American principles, instead of devotion to our institutions and to our own flag, we are to have an international super-

state resting upon Prussian force, with a vast army of repression; a superstate in which the national spirit stands rebuked and the international flag is the sole symbol of our hopes. I do not know what the future has in store.

God pity the ideals of this Republic if they shall have no defenders save the gathered scum of the nations organized into a conglomerate international police force, ordered hither and thither by the most heterogeneous and irresponsible body or court that ever confused or confounded the natural instincts and noble passions of a people. Let us leave these things—the lives of our people, the liberty of our whole nation—in the keeping and under the control of those people who have brought this Republic to its present place of prestige and power. What we need in this hour is faith in the institutions that our fathers gave us, faith in the career which everything indicates we shall enjoy unless we in public place prove recreant to our duties in this great, trying hour.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE PLAY

Some Confessions of a Woman Playwright

An Interview in One Act

By THE INTERVIEWER AND CLARE KUMMER

CLARE KUMMER, the author of "Annabelle," "A Successful Calamity," "The Rescuing Angel" and "Be Calm Camilla," has been accused of flavoring her plays with fairy spices. Believing herself to be unjustly charged with a tendency to imperil the sordid realities of life by mixing them with the sugary sentiment of fairy tales that never grow old, she denies it. The interviewer, a deplorable figure of speech, blunders with the usual ignorance of his wordy class, by knowing nothing about it.

ARGUMENT OF THE PLAY:—*There appears upon the scene that character, ever dear to the heart of all fairy tales, the FRIEND tried and true, a genie of wisdom who unfolds the Truth in that inimitable manner of all genii who know that life is made of fairy tales, though playwrights deny it as they will.*

CHARACTERS IN THE PLAY

CLARE KUMMER, by herself.
THE FRIEND (tried and true), by himself.
THE SILENT LADY, by courtesy of the management.
THE DOG, a part without words.
THE INTERVIEWER, by itself.

SCENE: *A room in an apartment in New York with a view of fairyland (really Central Park) from the windows.*

TIME: *Tea time.*

(*Enter Interviewer and Silent Lady*)

INTERVIEWER

Of course, she is delayed at her manager's office and we must wait. Managers are such an inconsiderate lot, they make such a fuss over plays.

THE SILENT LADY

If that is humor, it is too fearfully British. You must Americanize, really you must.

THE INTERVIEWER

I can't, and besides, it's no fun pretending you're something else than you are.

THE SILENT LADY

Imagine yourself about to write something serious if you like.

THE INTERVIEWER

Good Heavens! Interviews are usually fairy stories that never come true.

THE SILENT LADY

I am going to listen and decide for myself.

THE INTERVIEWER

I could write it without seeing her at all—they're much better done that way. Of course, I shouldn't tell you this, but people who are interviewed are not nearly as clever as they seem to be in interviews. It's not their fault, but they always believe what you say they've said.

THE SILENT LADY

I am sure that isn't true. They give you something to write about, surely!

THE INTERVIEWER

That's just it. If they only wouldn't.

THE SILENT LADY

Such egotism!

THE INTERVIEWER

I've got to ask her if most plays are fairy tales. Do you think she knows?

THE SILENT LADY

Do you know?

THE INTERVIEWER

Of course not, but I've got to make her say they are.

THE SILENT LADY

Why?

THE INTERVIEWER

Because there is an impression that her plays are like fairy tales, because they are so baffling to the critic.

THE SILENT LADY

Wait and see what she says.

THE INTERVIEWER (*impatiently*)

I sometimes wish I'd never seen a spelling book, then instead of writing silly interviews I might have been a railroad man, or an automobile salesman, or something original.

(*Through a wide doorway there enters noiselessly the Genie of Wisdom. His appearance is unheralded, unexpected. He walks very feebly, very slowly as if he were very ill. He wears a long robe* (*actually a dressing gown,*) *he glides without making the slightest noise* (*actually in felt slippers,*) *he is perfectly at home in his manner and assurance* (*actually he is at home*) *and all that one sees of him gives the impression of a very ill person about to greet two perfectly strange mortals* (*actually he is a gentleman who, because he is very ill, is in dressing gown and slippers, and he has come to welcome two impatient people in his own home.*)

THE FRIEND (*shaking hands in a cordial, charming greeting that is like those rare humans who have retained their natural sympathies in spite of a cruel world. He speaks very slowly, in a low tone.*)

She had to see her manager—she may be a little late—yes, she has another play, she always has another play. You see, I've been rather ill. I've just been paddling on the River Styx, I'm not sure whether I've landed or not.

(*He sinks feebly on a couch. The other two watch him with awe and sympathy. He speaks wonderfully good English for a fairy* (*actually he is nothing of the sort,*) *but to the audience he gives the impression of the unusual. There is about him the dignity and the tenderness of a supernatural*

being such as one expects in fairies (though actually he is only a remarkably felicitous man of intellectual pride who, while explaining why Clare Kummer's plays have in them a suspicion of fairy thought, betrays his own deep attachment to them.)

THE FRIEND

You will find it difficult, I am afraid, rather difficult.

THE INTERVIEWER

You mean she won't talk about her plays.

THE FRIEND

I scarcely know how to explain to you about her, she is so very elusive, so delightfully elusive. What is it you want to talk to her about?

THE INTERVIEWER

Are her plays taken from fairy stories?

THE FRIEND

If you mean fairy stories other people have written, they are not. But I think there is a certain very modern fairy-like quality about the plays she has written. What mortals call imagination, is the domain of fairyland, isn't it?

THE SILENT LADY (*eagerly*)

Of course—of course.

THE FRIEND

But so few people live long enough to find that out—that's the pity of it. Now, Clare is different, she lives there most of the time, and it is such a familiar homey place to her that she doesn't realize that she is really residing in the nicest sort of fairy tale of her own. She wouldn't tell you this herself because those whom she invites to be with her in imagination are real enough people of course, but they improve so in that atmosphere. In fairyland there are never any unhappy endings, are there?

THE SILENT LADY (*eagerly*)

Never—never.

THE FRIEND

She abhors unhappy endings. She simply won't have them in the house, that's all. (*He makes a gesture of help-*

lessness.) Obstinate, you think? Not at all, but so far she has only written comedies in which unhappy endings do not belong. (*He produces a cigarette, lights it slowly, sinks deeper into the cushions.*) But you'll find it very difficult. You will excuse me if I tell you that Clare detests interviews.

(*During a prolonged pause,* THE DOG, *a gentle, alert little animal, comes into the room, looks curiously at the two mortals and creeps lovingly to the side of the Genie, trembling as it is caressed.*)

THE FRIEND (*continuing*)

Her friends in the theatre are the people who, like herself, live a remote existence. William Gillette, for instance, she has known him since she was a child. They chatter away together in perfect understanding, irrelevantly, about things they alone know what they mean. She never discusses plays with him, he never discusses acting, that sort of thing does not seem to come to their thoughts. Like two birds they speak a joyous language all their own. As one critic said of her, she is baffling, delightfully baffling.

THE SILENT LADY (*encouraging him*)

A woman of inspiration?

THE FRIEND

Yes, it must be that. In her first play, "Annabelle," she drew a remarkably true characterization of a Western man, and yet, I don't think she had ever been west of Chicago. The lines which *Annabelle* speaks are like the wind, so direct, so refreshing, so unexpected. The critics in Boston thought it was a good play, the critics in New York were divided. It was her first play, and she didn't believe she could write a play at all when she began. Some of those chaps told her she couldn't. One critic dismissed the play with a paragraph. But the people kept coming, and coming, and coming!

THE INTERVIEWER (*speaking loud*)

It lacked technique, I suppose.

THE SILENT LADY (*aside*)

Sh-h! Be still.

THE FRIEND

No, the technique was there. Technique of a remarkable order, for back of the airy lightness was a dramatic story which was carried consistently all the way through the play. Except for being cut down, the play was produced exactly as it was written.

THE INTERVIEWER

Who was she?

THE SILENT LADY (*aside*)

I wish you'd keep still.

THE FRIEND

Who knows who anyone really was? There are people of whom one thinks that way, wondering where their spirit began and their mortal part ends. Her father was a Beecher, and there is in her spirit part of the Beecher whimsicality and wit. Her mother was a brilliant, fascinating, beautiful woman who left the gaiety and sparkle of society to go and live in the Beecher household. She gathered about her the most delightful people, organized an amateur dramatic club of which she was the moving spirit. Many tempting offers were made to her to become an actress, but she declined because she thought it incompatible with her name. You asked me who Clare was, perhaps you can vision how she grew up to be so fascinating and so clever. When she was still nobody in particular, and yet that most important person, a child, she could improvise beautiful music on the piano. People thought it wonderful because she wore short dresses, but it was a very mature spirit, wasn't it, in spite of them? That was her spirit part; as to her mortal part it is very timid, very shy, depending almost entirely for support upon her spirit, I should judge. The things she says and writes are true, but unexpected. There is an uncanny wisdom in her fairy tales, if you insist they are such, but I wouldn't advise you to tell her her plays are like that, if they are. Inspiration is such an odd event, isn't it? Clare lives in a remote stillness of her own that nothing outwardly can disturb. Her plays are predestined, they are not merely industry. She does not

work with the ordinary logic of work, she luxuriates in the domain of her imagination without the irksome restrictions mortals usually encounter. She writes in bed a great deal, an unusual place for industrious mortals to work, isn't it?

(*The bell rings. A maid opens the front door. Enter* CLARE KUMMER, *a mortal slender shape with dark hair and eyes and general air of repressed interest. Then follow the usual introductions, greetings, the rearrangement of the group. Only the Genie remains unmoved, seeing only that she is there.*)

THE INTERVIEWER (*briskly*)

Will you tell me please if most plays are fairy tales?

CLARE KUMMER (*hugging the dog on her lap desperately*)

Plays must be real, I think; don't you?

THE INTERVIEWER (*blatantly*)

What, for instance, are your ideas of play technique?

THE SILENT LADY (*gently*)

How can anyone explain inspiration?

CLARE KUMMER

Without an instinct for technique I don't think it would be possible to write a play. Of course, technique stalking along by itself is pitiful. To have a lot of technique and then write a play to fit it I should think would result fatally for both if not all three—the technique, the play and the playwright.

THE INTERVIEWER

Why don't you have villains in your plays?

CLARE KUMMER

I expect to. I am always expecting a villain in one of my plays. In fact, there was a villain in "Annabelle," only he happened to have died before the play began. *George Wimbledon's* father was a villain. He was just as real to me as any character in the play, although he never appeared. He was a terror. *George* was really very nice considering what a father he had.

THE INTERVIEWER

Really. Then your plays are not fantastic, as some people say?

CLARE KUMMER

They are as fantastic as life itself. What more can anyone ask? Don't misunderstand me—I have no objection to fairies, only up to date they have not happened in my plays. I shall welcome a fairy or a villain or anything that comes along. Only the villain must be real and the fairy, too. An insincere fairy I should consider very objectionable.

THE INTERVIEWER

Do you read Ibsen?

CLARE KUMMER

Yes. I love his plays because the people are real. They do and say what those people would have done and said. Watching two of his plays produced last season, I discovered that his work resembled mine. Yes, really; we are as much alike as a Pekinese and a St. Bernard can be. They have qualities in common, you know. You have to look for them, but they are there.

THE INTERVIEWER

Were any of your plays suggested by fairy stories?

CLARE KUMMER

Not one. Nothing was further from my mind than fairies when I wrote "Annabelle." Like her, I was "in great need of money." It was a very hot summer day, and I was in town longing to get to the country. I went down to spend the week-end with some friends on Long Island, and they had just returned from a motor trip to see, in the owner's absence, a wonderful country house. In this house the servants of the absent owner lived in luxury. The idea of a penniless "Annabelle" getting into such a household as cook came to me. I decided that it was good material for a play. Of course, the regulation complication would have been to have the owner of the house appear and marry *Annabelle*. I knew I did not want the regulation thing, because there is always something else that is longing to be done, so I constructed a "past" for *Annabelle*. Her cave-man husband—their meeting in

the hotel and his recognizing her and renting the house to which the poor dear fled in her desperation. This romance loomed very large in "Annabelle." I was obliged to make George Wimbledon, the owner of the wonderful house, drink heavily, so that there would be no doubt in the mind of the audience that she was married to the right man. I do not see any fairy story in "Annabelle," do you?

With the "Calamity" I was idly looking out of a hotel window across a lake when the idea came to me. The whole complete idea. Now, I am willing to admit the interference of a fairy in this matter. A friendly fairy, who saw that I was bored and thought I had better write a play at once. I wrote the first act of "A Successful Calamity" that afternoon. The play was finished in three weeks.

"The Rescuing Angel" I wrote without the aid or intervention of fairies. I thought I would like to get a new line on a girl marrying for love—a man for whom she felt an emotion so primitive that she was afraid to admit it even to herself, and pretending to herself and others that she was marrying to save her family from financial ruin, provided an interesting thesis. The character of the man loved was supposed to have been on the order of a charming, self-educated blacksmith who had made a fortune. I blame the fairies very much in that they did not provide us with the type of man necessary to play the part.

"Be Calm, Camilla," I was much surprised to hear resembled "Cinderella." But inasmuch as it deals with a girl who is poor and has a stroke of luck, I suppose the charge is not unfounded, and the fact that their names both begin with "C" makes it rather grave, tho' *Cinderella* never entered my mind until the critics spoke of her. "Be Calm, Camilla," is said to be my best play and to have more "heart" in it than the others. It is in part the story of myself at one time. I have lived at the "Belle Marie," and I know "Gus Beals." Only, instead of being run over by a wonderful automobile, I was run across by a wonderful manager, Arthur Hopkins.

(*An awkward pause follows*)

THE FRIEND

Yes, Clare is very patient about making her people in the play real. (*He rises with difficulty to his feet.*) She is very patient, too, about that most important event in life.

THE INTERVIEWER

What is that?

THE FRIEND

The curtain.

(*The rest of the action is without words. It ends with the closing of the front door.*)

PUTTING THE AEROPLANE TO WORK

Some Expert Opinions of Our Future in the Air

By WILLARD HART SMITH

COMMERCIAL aviation is knocking at our door. Four army planes have just flown across the American continent in fifty-two hours. The other day a big British "bomber" finished a flight from Cairo, Egypt, to Delhi, India, 2,900 miles. In the last month the Andes have twice been crossed via the air-line. Planes fitted up with a special cabin, cushioned passenger seats and tables, the whole inclosed in glass, are making the trip regularly between London and Paris.

Because of the slowness of rail communication, important documents from Paris to Alsace and Lorraine are being transmitted by air. Handley-Page, the great British airman, says that with such machines as exist today, it will be possible from London to reach Egypt in thirty-six hours, India in three days, and Australia in a week. He says that these flights can be run as commercial undertakings at a charge for passengers of six cents a mile. He believes that his new machines can easily do 2,700 miles without stop and that it is only a question of a few months when he can fly passengers across the Atlantic, four to a plane, at $1,000 per ticket, and land them in New York two days after leaving London.

We learn that the First British and International Aerial Navigation Company has secured "landing fields" and is only waiting the word of the Air Ministry to open a passenger service throughout the British Isles, to the Continent and gradually extend it to the Colonies. We learn that the British Government is seriously contemplating subsidizing the air industry so that private concerns will build thousands of planes, operating them as mail, passenger and precious

freight carriers. We see the British boldly grappling with the problem of the airplane in peace.

So much of a matter of course do they take it that their Air Ministry is now engaged in compiling a minute set of regulations for air traffic.

We discover that Germany, despite her being in the throes of a revolution, is already running air-line passenger, freight and mail services. So seriously do the Germans take the immediate commercial future of the aeroplane that they are doing their utmost to wriggle out of the terms of the armistice compelling them to surrender numbers of planes "in good condition." They are trying to surrender many defective planes and retain their big bombers for transportation lines. Commercial aviation knocked at the door of Europe and Europe heard, as with the armistice the roll of gunfire died away. And in the United States?

PLANES TO LAND IN CITY LOTS

SOME individuals see the opportunity. A few officials of the Government sense it. Here and there a publicist has visualized it. Some business men are awake to it. But the great mass of American people are wondering if the aeroplane can be put to work in peace pursuits. A plane in the sky, a straining of necks, eyes turned aloft, the curiosity of the moment satisfied, "I wonder if that fellow was at the front?" And in the worries about the high cost of living and the future of business the aeroplane is swiftly forgotten. While other nations are booming ahead with clarified plans for utilizing to full the peace-time possibilities of the aeroplane, our Congress, temporarily the supreme authority over American aviation, waits.

The leaders of American aviation tell us that this will not be for long. Individuals are stirring while the government which controls today the manufacturing of planes, the training and licensing of pilots, is making up its mind. Meanwhile those government officials who are awake to the situation are raising their voices. Only the other day Sec-

ond Assistant Postmaster General Praeger, director of our aerial mail, told a meeting of airplane manufacturers that they must develop a better commercial vehicle than "the thinly disguised army planes, a craft which could be landed in a city lot if need be, or better than that, a craft of such stability that it need never come down at all through emergencies. When you get this ship," said Praeger,—"and the man who doesn't believe it will come shortly has no place in aviation—then you will have a machine which will command a market, by the side of which all your government orders will pale into insignificance."

Coming as that prediction does in an official way, the boldness of it bids us look carefully into the aeroplane situation in our country. Is the day here when we must regard the peace-time aeroplane as something more than a toy for the rich? Has the speed of scout planes and the carrying capacity of bomber types, a vital significance in our country's commerce and travel?

POLICEMEN OF THE CLOUDS

ADVANCE thinkers in American aviation are agog with prospects and plans. The New York City Police Department will soon have a squad of twelve flyers. The idea was inspired by the fact that last summer army aviators soared above the burning munition plant at Morgan, New Jersey, and in directing the work of the fire fighters, prevented a great explosion of TNT. An inspection of the files of aeroplane companies near New York show that letters are coming in from business men inquiring about planes for commercial purposes, their cost, upkeep and life. From Colorado, Texas, and Oklahoma, from the oil fields have come letters asking for estimates on machines. The borax companies, weary of tediously hauling every ton of borax to civilization by twenty mules, are asking if planes can be used for transporting their product. Our cattle and sheep ranchers contemplate using scout-planes to locate their animals and to provision their far-riding herders on the trackless ranges via the air, instead of by pack burros. Mining companies in

the Andes and brigand-infested Mexico are wondering if their wealth cannot be transported to civilization through the air instead of on slow-going pack animals whose route is fraught with danger. Coffee and cocoa men of Latin America, remote from railheads and harbors, are asking about the airplane as a means of communication. The pot is boiling; but only here and there. The commercial possibilities of the aeroplane have not been brought home to the average man. If they were, we should today have a well-knit national plan, under national leadership, for putting the aeroplane to work.

The situation in America today reminds one of a pilot who has lost his way in the clouds and is fearful of coming down. Mr. Average Man reads one day of an explorer who from a plane is going to photograph the white regions about the North Pole. He sees in a "Sunday supplement" an imaginative drawing of a monster plane, a greyhound of the air, with de-luxe cabins, restaurants, smoking-rooms and promenades. He has seen similar pictures, on and off, for the last ten years and does not take them seriously. He has read how aeroplanes will usurp the work of steamships, railroads, automobiles; and these things do not come to pass. Imaginative "boosters" of aeronautics have made extravagant statements and promises, one upon another, all premature, impracticable of fulfillment.

AMERICA'S AMAZING STRIDES IN AVIATION

SUCH thoughts are merely the natural effect of the amazing strides that America has made in aviation since the war began. It is an industry which up to the signing of the armistice had turned out 12,285 complete planes and 31,814 engines. It is an industry which, allowing for the wastage of war, has caused the Government to own today more than 10,000 planes; and to have trained more than an equal number of pilots. The army aviators alone, now being returned to civil life, have flown, in total, almost a million hours or about seventy million miles. The national inventory shows, too, that the war has left us with about 150,000 men trained

by the army in airplane mechanics and administration. In the factories there was developed a new class of labor, thousands of men and women, skilled in the manufacture of planes and their parts. We have engineers, mechanics, woodworkers, fabric experts, propeller experts and instrument men.

We have the trained personnel of factories, each with its own staff of experts, which turned out the special tools and machines used in aircraft construction. We have plants equipped to make twenty different kinds of accessories. We have developed new products to furnish the raw materials. We so developed the spruce and fir industry in Oregon and Washington that by November of last year the monthly output of the forests had increased to 2,000,000 feet; a gain, over the time when we went to war, of 1,000 per cent. Because it was impossible to obtain the millions of yards of linen cloth necessary for the enormous number of planes we were building, we devised and made a cotton substitute at half the cost. In our great army flying-schools we changed flying from a haphazard, mysterious thing into the exact science of aeronautics. The nation was "sold" on aeroplanes—for the purposes of war. What about peace?

For the use of the sportsman practically all the existing types of American planes, with the exception of heavy bombers, are adaptable. The extent of the sporting market is problematical. It all depends on the number of young men of independent means in the air service who, having had a taste of flying for Uncle Sam, will want to continue it as a recreation. It is pertinent that of all our flying officers only about 2 per cent are "regulars," the balance being Reserve Officers, the overwhelming majority of whom are being discharged from the service. What proportion of these men can afford to fly planes?

Orville Wright says that the cost of operating a privately-owned plane is no greater than the expense of a comparatively small motor-boat, and thousands of young Americans are able to afford that. Wright does not believe that the failure of the past to interest men in owning planes for sport pur-

poses was due to an opinion that air navigation was unsafe; rather to the fact that the sportsman had nowhere to fly. He wanted to fly from city to city, as one would tour in an automobile, but there were no landing fields. Wright says that privately-owned planes will be popular when landing fields are established in such numbers that one could always be reached in the event of the motor stopping.

That is the kernel of the proposition of privately flown planes.

PLANS AERIAL TAXI SERVICE

ASKED to give his opinion on the future of aviation John North Willys, not an aviation fanatic, but a clear thinking business man with capital invested in the new industry, said: "One of the earliest uses for the aeroplane, and which, in my opinion, will come within the year, is the carrying of passengers between such points as New York City, Boston and Atlantic City as well as other sea coast cities. I look for the first passenger craft to be of the flying-boat type, because of its ability to land with greater safety as well as the possibilities of a landing point at any place along the coast."

This is well worth serious consideration for it would seem that the flying boat will make possible the operation of sky traction lines above waterways, while the lack of landing fields is delaying cross-country transportation projects.

Glenn Curtiss says: "Extensive flying over water is sure to come soon. Lakes, rivers and sheltered bays form ideal landing fields for flying water-craft. There are no difficulties caused by trees, wires, smoke-stacks, towers and buildings. Furthermore, the relative speed of boats, on which the world has to depend, is very slow, and therefore the aeroplane offers a considerable advantage. Competing with a sixty-mile-an-hour express train is more difficult than with a fifteen to twenty-mile boat. Passenger routes, mail and taxi service will unquestionably be in full operation soon.

The reason I believe marine flying will be developed quicker than land, is because there are no new landing fields needed. Terminal facilities are already provided. Quiet harbors, rivers and small lakes are ideal landing fields for seaplanes and flying-boats. Furthermore, there is no limitation as to width of a plane because there is ample room for even the largest sea-boats to maneuver. We know more about weather conditions on the sea, more about tides and more about the general directions of the wind than we do on land. America, of course, has always led in the production of flying-boats and seaplanes, and, under a vigorous naval policy, will continue to do so."

HOW MUCH DOES IT COST TO FLY?

BUT Mr. Average Man is not the Navy Department, and in considering the possibility of his supplementing his auto with a plane, the questions of cost, upkeep, life of an aeroplane and safety raise themselves pertinently. The L. W. F. Engineering Company, which, like the British who used to fly their new planes from factories in England across the Channel to the front, flew their products, when completed, from their plant near New York City to naval stations along the Atlantic coast, believes that cost is no obstacle to private ownership. They told the writer:

"The cost of operation of a plane is not as great as most people consider it to be. The entire cost of operation at present should not exceed forty or fifty cents a mile for a plane carrying five passengers. About ten cents per mile per passenger would amply cover the cost of operation maintenance and pay good dividends on the investment. This cost is decreasing rapidly. Among other factors, the cost of production of only a few machines of each type, expensive experimentation and lack of co-operation between design and economical production have, in the past, increased the initial cost of operation. The necessity of rapid production together with the high price of labor and material and the lack of trained men have added unduly to the cost in the past. With

the use of aircraft for commercial purposes all these items will be materially decreased, just as they have been decreased in the automobile, telephone and telegraph industries."

Concerning the life of a plane, John North Willys says:

"The average life of a motor contained in a fighting or war-plane did not at a maximum exceed fifty hours actual flying before it was necessary that the motor be torn down and overhauled. Motors used in commercial planes should have a longer life, as they would not be called upon to run at and sustain the high speeds of the fast fighting or war-planes. The Curtiss OX-5 motor contained in a Curtiss training plane has a much longer average life, in fact one of these motors performed the feat of actually flying 15,000 miles before being overhauled. An aeroplane motor is necessarily required to undergo greater strains and stresses than is required of the automobile motor, because the aeroplane motor is compelled the greater part of the time, while in flight, to run with its throttle wide open at maximum speed. The parts of the plane, other than the motor, should with ordinary usage and care last substantially as long as the average automobile."

ELIMINATING DANGER FROM FLYING

THE idea that every time a man goes up in an aeroplane he takes his life in his hands is, according to authorities, wholly fallacious. Curtiss tells us that flying is no more difficult than handling an automobile and shows us statistics to bear out his contention that the only accidents are caused by "joyriders of the sky," men who do "stunt flying" to thrill spectators.

Harry Bowers Mingle, President of the Standard Aircraft Company, which built many planes for the Government, says:

"As proof of the degree of stability with which airplanes can be built today we have manufactured a small target machine which flies up into space without a pilot and returns to earth when the gasoline runs out. All machines

being built for peace-time purposes contain the inherent quality of stability. They are constructed in such fashion that nothing less than the destruction of a vital part of the plane can render it useless. The common obstacles which confront the military aviator are completely overcome by this type."

All our planes were made for use in war. Can they be used in peace? The president of a large company states:

"All of the present type of machines now owned by the Government or in the process of manufacture throughout the country can be utilized with a moderate amount of adjustment for civil purposes."

While the president of another company says:

"The commercial adoption of the airplane is dependent upon its development and design along commercial lines."

The training planes, landing as they can at as low a speed as 37 miles an hour and capable of greater capacity by increasing the wing-spread, are suited for the Air Post until a new commercial type is developed. They are suited to that work and the carrying of parcels post and light express packages. The De Haviland-4, with a Liberty motor, was tried as a mail carrier. A fast fighting type, it is more suited to reconnoissance work—to the mapping out of air highways, photographing intercity routes from the sky, determining and mapping landing fields en route. Likewise it is good for police duties, observation work of any kind in a commercial way, flying over great forests and "spotting" trees of rare wood. The big bombing planes with their two Liberty motors, capable of carrying the deadweight of a ton in cargo and five men, can be used for the transportation of passengers, long non-stop flights and for carrying heavy express packages.

FEDERAL SUBSIDY FOR OUR AIR INDUSTRY

OUR aviation engineers have planned new types of planes—planes with brakes to assure greatly reduced speeds. They are thinking of increased reliability in flight

through the use of multiple-motor machines, thus greatly reducing the chances of a plane "going dead" in mid-air. They are thinking of comfort, increased by the use of limousine bodies, of life lengthened by progressive designing. They will lay stress upon maximum convenience, service and endurance, rather than on maximum speed planes built more heavily and sturdily, to be flown, unlike the war-plane, at three-quarter speed. And they are ready to build planes in which the motors are heavier per horse power, for it was the extreme lightness of military motors that caused their "life" to be so brief.

But these things are not yet. Nor will the building of new planes suited to commercial needs come to pass upon a large scale until American aviation knows where it stands. What is the Government going to do? The Government is opening mail routes and the Government is using army flyers, who are charting and mapping landing fields and danger spots from the air. All of this cannot be regarded as anything but good will, as the Government owns most of the machines that the Post Office is using and the route mappers are army officers, who fly army planes, and work of this sort is necessary training in the art of aviation.

Senator Thomas said: "I am satisfied that the importance and the development of the aircraft industry make it competent to take care of itself."

But the president of a large aircraft corporation says: "The Government should exercise a parental interest in this newest civic establishment. The most effective means of getting the work under way on a well-established basis would be to subsidize the commercial air routes, this, however, only to the extent of personnel and such equipment as can be released from the military and naval departments, and only for so long a time as is needed to place a particular air route on a basis of commercial operation. As soon as this has been accomplished to continue the same pioneer service on another selected route with the same object in view. . . . The Government should organize air ports, supply depots, repairing stations and emergency landing facilities. An experi-

mental station should be established by the Government for the purpose of co-ordinating aerodynamic research under a centralized control."

Other manufacturers declare that the Government should organize aerial ways, signalization, special maps, landing fields and atmospheric information bureaus. They say that flying-fields should be national property like sea harbors and that the Government should give financial assistance to the first commercial aeronautic companies. Others gloomily declare that unless the Government constructs landing-fields, these plans cannot be realized for many years and that American commercial aviation will be held back in its development correspondingly. But while waiting for some word from Washington, such as England has uttered to her people, alert Americans here and there are already putting the aeroplane to work.

EDITOR'S NOTE

In the April FORUM *Mr. Smith will complete his series on the commercial future of the aeroplane with an article discussing aerial mail, aerial passenger-carrying, aerial highways and trans-Atlantic flying from the viewpoint of commerce. He will also show in detail what every nation in the world is today doing in aerial post and aerial transportation of passengers and light freight. A message for America to awake, if we would not fall behind in the "control of the air."*

BRITAIN'S CONQUEST OF THE SKIES

An Object Lesson for America

By SEVERANCE JOHNSON

[The FORUM'S Foreign Correspondent]

WHILE the Peace Conference delegates were discussing the "Freedom of the Seas," England was devoting her vast resources and her traditionally persistent energies to the "Conquest of the Skies." The British have come to realize that the world empire of the future will be dependent on ships of the air, as well as ships of the sea.

I visited a British aviation field on the outskirts of London, where I witnessed an army of mechanics and aviators at work in a veritable city of aerodromes. Airships more than half as wide as a New York City block were being assembled, tested, and perfected.

"We are just as busy, despite the armistice," said the officer in charge. "England has built up a great aerial fleet, and it is her intention to keep on building. We hope to have machines inside of a year that will fly across the Atlantic. They will be a combination of the aeroplane and the dirigible. At present no aeroplane can carry enough petrol to make the transatlantic flight. A combination ship, however, can be constructed which will fly from London to New York or Chicago without difficulty."

My visit to this British aviation center was made at the invitation of the British Government. England has no desire to hide her plans of aerial achievement. Instead she seeks publicity to arouse the co-operation of private interests. The British Government has plainly announced that the initial development of aeronautic transportation should be under the direction of the State: but that, in order that airships may

more and more take the place of railroads and water craft, private individuals and corporations must also take up the work. The government, therefore, has instituted a thorough campaign of aeronautical education in which Lord Weir, Secretary of State for the Royal Air Force, and other officials, have been traveling through England, delivering speeches, and exhorting the British people to give all possible aid. At Manchester, Lord Weir visited the National Aeroplane Factory and, after telling the workmen they were employed in the finest aeroplane factory in the world, he added: "Whatever can be done industrially in other countries, we can do better in England if we decide to do it at all." Later before the Manchester Chamber of Commerce he said: "In August, 1914, the Flying Services consisted of 285 officers and 1,853 other ranks. In November, 1918, the strength of the Royal Air force consisted of 30,000 officers, 260,000 men, and 30,000 women and boys.

"Even those of us in the heart of this great industry have scarcely grasped the significance of the prodigious strides made during the later months of the war. I will offer you just a single fact. We now possess aeroplanes which carry a crew of seven and passengers to the number of 30, which climb to a height of 10,000 feet, which travel at a speed of 100 miles an hour, and which can make a journey of 1,200 miles without a stop.

"We possess such machines for travel over land, and similar machines which, if necessary, can come down on the surface of the seas, float and rise again with a full load."

Lord Weir said that the present Air Ministry should be expanded to meet every new problem arising from the commercial employment of airships, that it should be in the charge of a few men, highly paid, and of the very best efficiency. He then appealed to private interests to co-operate:

"I would like to see the big shipping and other existing transport organizations actively interesting themselves in this development."

INTERNATIONAL AIR CONVENTION NEEDED

"AN international air convention was imperatively necessary," he said, and added: "I may say we have already drafted the articles of this convention, which was submitted to our allies. I have reason to believe that within the next four or five months the principal nations of the world will have reached an agreement on this momentous question."

According to the plans of the British Air Ministry, so far as its own aerial program is concerned, it may be said that the British Government is to take permanent possession of a large number of military aerodromes and lease them to private interests. The State will merely charge a fee for landing, which will spare aerial transportation companies a large initial expense entailed in the construction of such stations, as well as returning to the government some return on its capital invested.

The Imperial Air Department will assume charge of the training of pilots, and thus assure the creation of a corps of men whose skill will be of the highest and thus guarantee as far as possible the successful operation of all British aircraft.

The government, furthermore, will map out all aerial routes, establish meteorological stations and furnish a continual wireless service along all aerial lines regarding atmospheric conditions and all other information necessary for aerial navigation.

Major-General F. H. Sykes, Chief of the British Air Staff, in speaking of England's aeronautic plans, said:

"Last June arrangements were begun to bring aerial reenforcements from America to Europe. We found that the accomplishment of a transatlantic flight is not so much one of endurance of machine and personnel, as of navigation, meteorology and wireless. It is necessary to supply the aerial voyager with advance information regarding weather conditions the whole length of his route. We also know that at present our machines even when navigated accurately have

very little more endurance than that required to reach the intended destination."

OVERLAND SKY ROUTES TO ASIA AND AFRICA

THE overland routes which have been laid out by the British Air Ministry to link up the various parts of the British Empire, including those regions where British arms have triumphed during the war just past, form a veritable network in which England, Asia and Africa will be brought within a few days of each other. One trunk line is from London to Cairo, by the way of Marseilles, Pisa, or Rome, Taranto, Suda Bay, Crete; and Sollum, on the African coast. From Cairo one line runs to India and the other to Cape Town, Africa. The Asiatic route is via Damascus, Bagdad, Bussorah, on the Tigris, Bushire, the Bunder-Abbas coast, Charbah-Karachi, on the Indian coast, Hyderabad, Jodhpur, and Delhi. Twenty-five aerodromes have been ordered built or have been already constructed for this line, the total distance of which is 6,000 miles.

Major Sykes said that airships should be able to make a weekly mail service between London and India as a standard aeroplane should make the trip in seven or eight days.

Major-General W. G. H. Salmond, commanding the Royal Air Force in the Middle East, flew from Egypt to Delhi in an experimental flight of 3,233 miles in only 47 hours, 21 minutes. The longest single flight was from Damascus to Bagdad (495 miles) in 6 hours, 53 minutes. During the journey from Damascus to Mesopotamia the aeroplane carried a seven days' supply of food and water. The machine had already flown from England and taken part in the Palestine operations.

The other route upon which the Royal Air Force is working runs from Cairo to the Cape, thus consummating, aerially, what Cecil Rhodes sought to do by rail. Survey parties have been sent out from Cairo to map out the details of the line, the best stopping places, and points of connections with branch lines that will traverse every part of Africa and

penetrate many miles of wilderness at present little known to the outside world. Two main north and south routes are being considered, one from Cairo along the Nile and across land to Lake Tanganyika, Baira, Lorenzo Marques, Durban, Port Elizabeth and Capetown; the other along the first route to Lake Tanganyika, and thence to Bulawayo, Pretoria, Johannesburg, Bloemfontein, Capetown. The first, 5,700 miles long, will be for flying boats; the latter, 5,300 miles inland, for aeroplanes.

Since the armistice was signed it has become known that the R. A. F. communication squadron between August and November, 1918, made 279 cross-country flights as, for example, from London to Paris, Nancy, Dunkirk, Manchester and York, without a single crash. One pilot, who is over 40 years old, crossed the Channel 287 times.

AIRSHIP HOLDS MORE PROMISE FOR COMMERCIAL EXPLOITATION

ACCORDING to Major Sykes the airship has more promise for commercial exploitation than the aeroplane. "The airship has practically no limit to its range, provided it can be made large enough," said the British Chief of Air Service to the London Chamber of Commerce. "The large rigid airship is still in an embryonic stage, but enough has already been accomplished to show that with increased capacity there is no reason why they should not be built capable of completing the circuit of the globe."

One of the devices, which has been perfected for enabling aircraft to travel through fog and cloud and the darkest night without fear of losing the way, was developed by the British during the war. It is still a secret. It consists of a wireless apparatus which keeps the aeronaut in constant touch with various meteorological stations. "Aircraft so equipped," said Major Sykes, "can fix their position constantly and report to their base at any time. The ground transmitting stations are a kind of aerial lighthouse or beacon, unaffected by fog and with a range of visibility of 600

or 700 miles. Their cost would be £60,000 or £70,000 a station."

In connection with the statements of Major Sykes regarding dirigible airships, an article in the *Evening News* that the British Admiralty is planning the construction of airships, containing 2,500,000 cubic feet of gas and capable of lifting 60 tons, may be regarded as extremely significant. The *Evening News* went on to say that these aerial super-dreadnoughts would have a radius of 8,000 miles and a speed of 80 miles an hour. Each will carry a crew of 25 men. A regular mail and passenger service between Great Britain and the United States during 1920 will be established, the London newspaper also stated.

FRENCH AERONAUTICAL EXPERTS ALARMED

IN France the dirigible has not been regarded as seriously as in England, and in consequence many of the French aeronautical experts have taken alarm. Count de la Vaulx recently in *Le Matin* said:

"In France the failure of the Zeppelins has become a thing in which we have put our faith. It is not so with our allies, the British. England has at present 15 rigid dirigibles in construction or in service, and is looking forward to a still greater program.

"Why this difference of viewpoint? For the simple fact that England is a maritime nation. She has come to know that if Zeppelins may have been vulnerable over the land, they are not in similar danger over the sea."

The writer then averred that the dirigible had proved its superiority in long-distance flying, as in 1917 a Zeppelin was ordered from Bulgaria to German East Africa with a cargo of various war munitions. It departed and on reaching the vicinity of Khartoum received a wireless that it should return, as the Germans, whom it had gone to aid, had surrendered.

The airship wheeled about and returned in safety, having been aloft four days without landing.

MISTAKE THE ALLIES MADE

COUNT DE LA VAULX said that the Allies made a great mistake in not demanding the surrender of all the German dirigibles. As the armistice was drawn, only Germany's aeroplanes were to be turned over to the Allies. He intimated very strongly that even now the Germans were engaged in a great program of aerial construction, and that after the peace treaty has been signed German airships will sail forth to every part of the world.

"The distance from Hamburg to New York is about 6,500 kilometers," he said, "and this passage across the Atlantic by a super-Zeppelin is perfectly practicable."

MY STAGE PRINCIPLES

An Actress Reveals the Personal Creed of Her Stage Career

By FRANCES STARR

THE dual life (not the double life) of an actress is really not so troublesome as fictitious rumor might make it appear. The character of an actress, like that of any other woman who develops economic preferences, is exposed to the affection of her friends, friends she could not exist without, and yet friends who hold their breath as she progresses in her stage career. They love her, she loves them, but there is that delicate, lustrous line of footlights that divides them.

That line is susceptible of a new interpretation if we accept it respectfully.

Most women make their own altars on which they burn a peculiar incense of their own, in homage, of course, to their own creed. In this way women have cultivated reserves, because they do have these private altars where they face things unreservedly—and alone.

The world is so full of people improving their lives or degrading them, that one sometimes is at a loss to find one's course in the crowded passage of real and unreal emotion. I have found it difficult sometimes to push through, to go forward, to escape the restraint of complex opinion. Having firm objections to the controversial faculty, I have perhaps failed to meet these opinions frankly, to explain the relation which I have as a woman to my profession as an actress on the stage. Those who know me best find contradictions in the actress and the woman. Because this is a question that may stimulate interest in the very important influence of the theatre upon men and women of all degrees, it is perhaps worth while to attempt a definition of certain hidden principles which belong to a stage career, principles easy to understand, and which are when understood strengthening.

WHY WOMEN GO ON THE STAGE

ARTISTIC occupations attract women chiefly because they are by instinct more curious about the spiritual mysteries of life than most men, and because these occupations are themselves profitable. It is customary to adorn women with certain impractical impressions that are quite false. The economic advantages of a stage career to a woman who has a desire for independence are superior to any other within her reach. I believe most actresses have chosen a stage career with a very intelligent reason, in spite of some elaborate sensational explanations which are often made for them. We may aspire to romantic excuses to clothe our experiences, but shorn of all romantic adornment the actress goes on the stage because she expects to earn a good salary. Every woman knows that her own money is better than someone else's, and every woman today is rebellious against any hindrances to self-support. Therefore, we can assume that the first principle that makes a woman chose the theatre for a career is her personal independence.

IS THE THEATRE DANGEROUS?

THIS of course brings up the issue which her dearest friends constantly impose upon her—the dangers of the theatre. I never hear the phrase without a secret resentment against it. One can easily describe these dangers, if one's imagination runs in that direction, but I think the majority of women who are out in the world, as the novelists say, do not find the dangers they are told to expect.

The dangers of the theatre have always been obvious but entirely indescribable by those who are in the theatre. In fact it is not the theatre that is dangerous—it is the people in the theatre, more often the people outside who are looking for danger in the theatre, and find it. They find it because acting is an emotional experience, a dual impression of feeling that might be true. It is because the theatre always touches the emotions of people who are not in the theatre that it is dan-

gerous to them. If they were actually working in the play themselves, they would realize how wholly impersonal the actress really is in the love scene she projects.

There are depressing days, there are introspective valleys through which all women pass in the adjustment of their emotions, but as a whole the woman who meets danger is perhaps looking for it. However, we are complex beings, and there is no searchlight of opinion by which we can fasten the direction in which a woman's feeling is moving. No woman of the stage can mix the life of the theatre with that of her home and friends. I am fortunate in having very dear friends who watch my stage performance with more or less misgivings. Every time a new play is announced for me, they seem to get together and whisper to one another, "What will she do next?" I understand perfectly how sincere and affectionate their anxiety for me is, but I find it quite impossible to explain to them that the characters I interpret in that other world across the footlights in which they have no place are entirely separated from myself.

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ACTRESS

ONE is, of course, deeply grateful for these tender considerations that occur only to prevent the indiscretions which they fear are in the theatre. They have been dreadfully disturbed, silently mystified when they have seen me in plays like "The Easiest Way," "The Secret," "The Case of Becky," and just now "Tiger! Tiger!" These women of the theatre, which from my fireside I can look at with entirely impersonal interest, were of course unconventional. In my identity as Frances Starr I became neurotic, or vicious, or weak, or a bit mad in obedience to the playwright, and I abandoned myself to a truthful interpretation. That is perhaps the second principle which a successful actress must adopt. It is a principle that is a natural outcome of any artistic endeavor. Every human being represents a story adaptable to artistic expression. The artist is not the judge of the right or wrong in these people. Artists are not

moralists—they could never arrive at any interpretation in art if their purpose was merely that of the moralizing preacher. It may be that the artist in the theatre can point a moral, but when he does it is entirely incidental to the motive of the performance. I am quite sure that the people on the stage do have a sense of moral responsibility.

In my own attitude toward the theatre I have always felt myself obliged to find a message of some spiritual character in the plays I appeared in. There are bad women in life, and dramatists have found them sensational box-office successes—but I have never consented to present any character on the stage that did not have the redeeming feature of some regeneration. If one did not combine with the work of one's life something more tangible than the reward in money, one would be very useless. I have tried to be useful in the theatre, not merely to myself, but useful to the theatre-goer. I feel that this should also be a principle which all artists in the theatre should consider. I have been very careful of this principle myself, although my friends have sometimes been shocked at the unconventional way in which it has been kept. They do not quite understand that the artistic necessities and impulses of acting have no connection whatever with one's private character.

THE SACCHARINE HEROINE

I BEGAN with quite a different set of principles. I began my stage career with the idea that my chief appeal in the theatre was that of the "sweet young girl." I began with the principle of the saccharine heroine, which consists in crowding the theatre on matinees. This future was beautifully heralded for me in "The Rose of the Rancho." My friends were ecstatically happy. They all said I had found my niche in the theatre. A long career stretched before me of sugary parts and the matinees were crowded with young girls. A certain obstinacy in me objected to this outlook. I felt that as an actress I should be able to play any part—not one part. So there came "The Easiest Way." It was

a study of a somewhat volatile, wavering girl, quite as good as a girl should be, but lost in the whirl of her own undecisive character.

The great price that must be paid for any violation of the spiritual laws is the prevailing motive of this play, as it has been of every play that I have appeared in. I like the tragic evolution through which the emotions always arrive at a spiritual clarity. I confess that I was somewhat in doubt about "The Secret." I saw it the other day played in French, and I was more than ever convinced that my uncertainty as to its essential value to the theatre, rather than its dramatic value, was just. Of course what this play really did was to reveal the disaster of jealousy in women—or their secret vanities. In that respect no doubt it was a new and keen analysis of the peculiar jealousies women show of each other, towards each other. The heroine of the play had an inordinate desire to make everybody happy—but she was extremely jealous of anyone else who attempted the same thing.

In "The Case of Becky" the heroine was a study in neurology. Out of the darkness of her neurotic state, however, her spirit emerged. As I review more closely these characters, it is quite clear that if any of their qualities were in my character I should have been perfectly mad by this time.

SELF-EFFACEMENT VITAL

SO another of the vital principles for an actress is the principle of self-effacement during the hours in the theatre. There is no danger in this abandon of emotion to artistic necessity, because it is work. It has nothing to do with one's friends who are the dearest part of one's life, but who might become dull and tiresome except for the reaction of one's work.

It so happens that the performance I am giving in Knoblock's play, "Tiger! Tiger!" has especially exposed me to the well-intentioned criticism of my friends. There are times when they have made me feel as though my work in the theatre was very bad for me. I have been very much

depressed by the opinions of those I love, most of which did not agree with my own. I have not discussed my views of "Tiger! Tiger!" because I object to controversy, and chiefly, perhaps, because I think my continuous purpose in the theatre has been to demonstrate the spiritual motives in women's lives. There are no saints in petticoats because they could not tread the byways of the world and sustain the standards of saintliness. The prevailing virtue of the heroine in "Tiger! Tiger!" is the fact that she believes all that she lives, and she lives in the magnificent cleanliness of her primitive soul. She is not to be bought, but her love is not to be denied. And when the awakening comes, and she discovers that there is a wide difference of caste between her and the man she loves, she does not flinch from the issue. She leaves him bravely and marries a man of her own caste and so buries any suspicion of dishonor that might otherwise be attached to her story.

THE THEATRE MUST AMUSE

BECAUSE I appear to understand these emotions of the modern woman, and because I find voice and presence with which to interpret them, some people insist upon associating my personality with them. There are plays with a very frank appeal that cannot be mistaken. Plays that reveal only the amusing side of folly and omit the outcome. I was recently advised, by a man whose opinion I have always valued concerning certain moral values of the play, to go and see a play which he recommended to stimulate my stage ideals. I saw it, and it was such a poor play that I was far from being stimulated—I was bored.

After all, it is necessary to be amused in the theatre, to be entertained, or to be stimulated. There are some theatres which invite the stimulants one can get around the corner, and others where the stimulus is presented in good dialogue, in portraits of life from life, and with a story that sends the people out of the theatre inspired with a better impression of their own problems than they had when they came in. One of the valuable principles for the artist to pursue is the need

of being refreshed from the draught of one's secret problems. In this respect I have not violated the rules of art, I have insisted that any part I create shall inspire absolute spiritual cure for any tragic crisis.

DO AN ACTRESS' INTERPRETATIONS CONTAMINATE HER?

AN actress is frequently asked what the influence upon her nature may be of the various parts she presents. It has been suggested that a woman of the stage endangers her moral nature by interpreting moments of moral crises in women of the stage. There are always bad ladies who are glorified in some artistic guise, but no matter how becoming this masquerade, the bad lady is rather an ugly, useless, undesirable association. An actress can depict with perfect understanding a woman's bad character, without being impressed favorably by it herself. She may give a very fine performance of a most undesirable character, but that does not mean that she is herself at all in sympathy with it. Of course, there enters into such performances the quality of abandon which is so important in drama. But it is an abandon always kept in perfect control, just as the painter controls the brush with which he colors his sympathy for the scene he is painting. Acting is something like that. There is a subconscious duality of perception, for while the actress is playing a part in the play, she is never unconscious of the fact that she is acting. There is no such thing as complete abandonment of one's mind, one's soul, or one's morals in the theatre. The women of the theatre, like other women of the world, have their own moral responsibilities, their own obligations, their private standards which they do not surrender because they are temporarily cast in stormy emotional roles.

POWER OF PERSONALITY

THERE is of course in acting a great deal to be said about personality. Many of our favorite actors and actresses have enjoyed their fame through this appeal. Their charm

is really themselves, for they are the same delightful, magnetic, amusing people in every play. Personally, I believe that the theatre is a place in which acting comes first—personality should be subservient to it. I am very frank in my outlook upon all conditions of people and I believe that there is good—even spirituality—in all of them. I have no faith in traditions that interfere with this frankness of vision. I am not afraid to look things in the face, because in doing so I find the best in everyone. The emotions of my work may be woven out of the fabric of my own heart; the pattern of feeling which is different in every play is designed by the impulses of my heart, and since it is my aim to be sincerely useful to the world in the art of acting, it seems to me that these beliefs which underline my work must eventually strengthen my nature as a woman.

NEED WE FEAR IMMIGRATION?

What We May Expect as a Result of the War

By HON. ANTHONY CAMINETTI

[COMMISSIONER GENERAL OF IMMIGRATION]

ALL prophecy right now can consist of little more than conjecture, and by the nature of conditions must be largely futile. This is particularly true of prophecies as to immigration, for we do not know what the policies of governments, including our own, will be, nor, more important still, what effect the war and its aftermath will have on the instincts and inclinations of those people who might be classed as potential immigrants to our country.

Shall our pre-war record of immigration be re-established or exceeded, or will, as some predict, the tide turn the other way and America become an emigrant instead of an immigrant nation? There is but one concrete, non-conjectural answer which is, "We do not know."

No doubt the effect of the war on the migration and distribution of people will be far-reaching but just how no one can in detail tell with any degree of precision.

One would have thought naturally that many Europeans would have endeavored to escape the actual fires of war by emigrating to America or other countries far from the war zone. Of course shipping and other conditions made emigration difficult. However, it would seem that the war tended to depress rather than to stimulate the instinct of migration among the peoples most vitally affected by the violence of the conflict.

Immigration to this country from Europe fell off tremendously as soon as the war began in 1914, and continued to decline more or less steadily until, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, there was but little net gain in our

population from that source. In fact during that year only 110,618 immigrant aliens entered the United States from all sources, while 94,585 immigrant aliens left the country during the same period. This left a net gain of less than 18,000.

The decade preceding the opening of the European war gave us annually an average immigration exceeding one million and the net increase in population from immigration sources in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, was 769,276.

WHAT INFLUENCES IMMIGRATION

SPEAKING broadly two considerations underlie nearly all alien immigrations:

1. Social conditions.
2. Economic conditions.

The first brought about the founding and original development of our country.

The second accounted largely for the phenomenal growth in population characterizing the last fifty years of our history and upon which was builded our modern-day industrial greatness.

Whatever changes the war will cause, it may be assumed that the migration of peoples will continue to be influenced as heretofore by social and economic conditions, barring, of course, artificial restraints or inducements.

Therefore, immigration to the United States or emigration from the United States in coming years is apt to depend substantially on the social and economic conditions existing in this and those other countries whose citizens are admissible as immigrants.

Thus the effect of the war on immigration will be to a large extent, for some years, influenced by the political and economic changes caused or produced by the war.

SOCIAL IMPROVEMENTS ABROAD DUE TO THE WAR

IT is probable that the war will produce great social improvements throughout most of Europe. The many reforms projected and the promise of land distribution to the

masses in many countries where hitherto it has been held by the privileged few may retard the current that has been flowing towards us for generations; and yet, with all that, the average European is likely to continue to look upon our country as the great haven of freedom. And there is no doubt in my mind that many thousands will continue to seek refuge here for the same reasons, though they may not be so potent, as inspired the bulk of our early immigration.

Nothing but pure conjecture can be ventured as to the future operation of the other chief moving force in the tide of immigration, *i. e.*, economic conditions.

If European countries maintain the validity of their war obligations, taxes will in future years demand a tribute which few persons until lately believed any people could bear. Those burdens may be reduced somewhat through lessened expenditures on military establishments, more economical governments and more equitable distribution of the taxes, but that they will be far beyond those of *ante-bellum* days, then considered highly oppressive, is certain.

Yet we must realize that the citizens of a number of European countries, England of course is included in this statement, bore, during the past four years, burdens far weightier than any they can expect for the future; and that those burdens were accompanied in some ways by a degree of individual prosperity among the masses exceeding any they had ever enjoyed in peace times. That such prosperity was economically false, may be true; but the fact is that, despite the tremendous tax of active war, workmen in nearly all the countries involved enjoyed better wages, and more favorable wage margins, than they had been accustomed to.

While food conditions in Europe for the present are distressing and threaten much suffering, such is only a temporary or passing factor which will be removed as peace-time production gets under way.

We must remember also that the four years of war had great adverse effect on the populations of European countries. While emigration all but ceased, millions were killed or died from disease or wounds at the front, millions were

incapacitated, millions of civilians died or were broken by the strains and privations of war, and the birth-rate dropped almost universally.

Then, also, it may be estimated that there is more work at hand in Europe for those who survive, or rather more work needing to be done than was the case before. All the vast destruction of war calls, at least potentially, for replacement and the deficits in the implements of peace-time commerce caused by the deflection of energies into the activities of war need to be replenished. Indeed, the outlook for the European workingman of the peasant class, barring the period of adjustment from war to peace, may be much better than it was before the war.

Despite the tremendous destruction caused by the war and the huge debts incurred by the governments involved, and the consequent possible increase in taxation, it is not extravagant to imagine a post-war Europe offering to the potential immigrant attractions superior to those he had prior to 1914.

It is also true that the experience of war intensified the love of most Europeans for their native lands and gave added potency to the feeling of Auld Lang Syne. Many thousands who otherwise would have sought new lands will now find it difficult to break the bonds of blood and suffering which the war has added to the usual ties binding them to the environment of their fathers.

LARGE IMMIGRATION OF SOLDIERY POSSIBLE

CONVERSELY, the conditions mentioned may inspire many to seek new scenes in which to try and forget the experiences they have known and witnessed; and this may also affect the millions of soldiers, most of whom—despite the heavy casualty lists—are strong and virile, will be released from the armies to find new life niches wherever they can. The migratory spirit has ever been strong among veterans of wars. And the veterans of the Allied armies are likely to feel a veneration and respect for America even exceeding that always felt by the masses in Europe. Con-

tact with our soldiers no doubt has enhanced their visions of American liberty, freedom and economic well-being even beyond the reports of fact and fancy which have ever made America a fairyland of promise to the peasantry of the Old World.

Of course immigrants will come.

Events only will indicate the comparative extent and duration of the movement. No doubt considerable more will come as soon as travel facilities are provided than arrived during the active war years, when as stated the net additions to our population from that source were negligible. Whether the tide will reach former proportions depends upon circumstances in this country and abroad.

Whatever may happen in the matter of volume, we may be assured that under existing laws there will be such an inspection that will cause to be debarred all those who cannot pass the prescribed tests. These will include not only all of those physically, mentally and morally not entitled to admission, but also that still more undesirable type commonly referred to as anarchists, who come for license rather than freedom.

WILL THE UNITED STATES BECOME AN EMIGRANT NATION?

THE statement recently given public attention that the United States is in danger of becoming an emigrant nation, should not be taken seriously. No doubt many residents of this country of foreign nativity whose kin have suffered from the privations and horrors of war may visit the place of their birth to give comfort and aid to their loved ones; but in my opinion a large majority of them will return to the places in which they have prospered. No valid foundation has been found upon which to base the radical change predicted. Such statements have encouraged plans to bring in laborers, now prohibited by law, to fill the places of those who would become part of the emigrating classes.

Without now taking up the claim that more laborers will be needed, whether or not the prediction is verified, I desire

to call attention to the fact that a supply exists in abundance in Porto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the Philippines. What better way could be found to build up these possessions or what more suitable plan be devised to bind them to us, to obtain their confidence, to secure their trade, and aid their development, than to engage a portion of their people in our industries on the mainland? We would benefit them immensely and also avoid the reappearance of a disturbing problem that it has been our hope, from economic and other viewpoints, had been settled more than a quarter of a century ago.

SOCIALISM IN FRANCE

Its Economic Forms and Political Methods

By AUGUSTIN HAMON

[PROFESSOR AT THE UNIVERSITÊ NOUVELLE, BRUSSELS, AND AT THE COLLÈGE LIBRE DES SCIENCES SOCIALES, PARIS]

THE Socialist Party is the only French political party that is strongly organized on a democratic basis. One of the causes of its great influence lies in French inward and outward politics. All men and women above eighteen years of age may join the party if they agree to the following principles:

"International understanding and action of the workers, political and economical organization of the working class in class-party for the conquest of power and the socialization of the means of production and exchange, that is to say, the transformation of the capitalistic society into a collectivist or communist society."

Such is the constitutional basis of the party that bears the official name of "Parti Socialiste, Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière."

Before the war the party counted some 75,000 subscribers. By 1915 the war had reduced them to 25,000. It is a party of young men (the majority of socialists being recruited among workmen, few of whom reach old age), the proportion of old men being very small and that of men from forty-five to sixty not high. After mobilization large numbers ceased their subscriptions to the party. But in 1915, when the needs of industry called workers back to factories, the syndicates increased in number and the Socialist Party grew again to 34,000.

But as a fact, Frenchmen hold various political opinions. I may truthfully state, however, that excepting a small minority they are all Republicans and Royalism is dead, though some of its supporters still talk loudly.

The Republicans include Progressists, Liberals, Conservatives; Radicals, Radical-Socialists, and Socialists. The first group constitute a very small minority. The other groups hold some views in common, among others their strong democratic tendency. The French democrats are recruited among the peasantry, the workmen and the "petit bourgeois" (traders, clerks, skilled laborers). Beyond question they constitute the bulk of the nation.

SOCIALIST STRENGTH IN CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES

IF we take for a basis the representation at the Chamber of Deputies—elected in April, 1914—we find approximately that the Radicals and Radical-Socialists make up 5/10 of the voters; the Socialists—including the so-called Independent Socialists—2/10; the Progressive-Liberal-Conservative Republicans, 2/10; the Royalists, scarcely 1/20. The balance, 1/20, is made up of citizens who, without disregarding political strife, refrain from voting. They often hold very advanced opinions, for many among them are Anarchists or have Anarchist tendencies. Those who belong to the rich classes seldom refrain from voting.

Those known as Socialists are the "Independent Socialists"; and those called "Socialistes Unifiés" in pre-war times were grouped in one party composed of various Socialist groups joined in one. Today they are simply called "Socialists."

The "Independent Socialists" have but a few representatives in the Chamber of Deputies. They number perhaps 1/30 of the electors. Messrs. Briand, Augagneur, Viviani belong to this group, which is a kind of transition between the Radicals and the Socialist Party. Their program is not essentially Socialist, for their object is not the socialization of the means of production. On the other hand, the Anarchist-Communists must be held Socialists, considering the communistic character of the ideal they are trying to realize. They are few in number, but have much influence among the workers' groups. Their influence was greater still some fifteen to twenty-five years ago. Let me mention

among them Paul Reclus, a nephew of the illustrious geographer and sociologist Elisée Reclus; Jean Grave, André Girard, etc. Others, without giving up their ideal of liberty and communism, joined the Socialist Party, being of opinion that collective action alone made it possible to change capitalism into a socializing and afterwards socialistic society.

THE SOCIALIST PRESS

THE Socialist Party spreads its propaganda at frequent private and public meetings in towns, large and small, by booklets and leaflets, and of course in daily and other newspapers. Jean Jaurès, until his death the dominating personality in French Socialism, founded *L'Humanité,* the organ of the French Socialist Party. His successor as editor was Pierre Renaudel, a Deputy, but after the Congress of Paris, last October, he was supplanted by M. Cachin, also a Deputy. Another Parisian Socialist paper, the evening *Populaire,* is edited by Jean Longuet, a Deputy, and Paul Faure. It is an exponent of the policies of the *minoritaires,* with whom I shall presently deal. The daily *France Libre* represents the group known as " The Forty."

In the provinces, *Le Populaire du Centre* (Limoges), *Le Midi Socialiste* and *Le Droit du Peuple* (Grenoble) are purely socialistic dailies partly affiliated with Federations. A few " bourgeois " papers that publish articles by Socialists and are sometimes edited by Socialists are *L'Heure,* edited by M. Marcel Sembat; *Le Journal du Peuple,* edited by M. Henry Fabre. Of the same kind are *La Vérité, Le Pays, La Lanterne,* edited in Paris; *La Dépêche de Toulouse,* etc.

Among the weeklies are *Le Cri du Peuple* (Brest), edited by E. Goude, a Deputy; *La Défense du Cher, La République Sociale* (Aude); *Le Socialiste Nivernais* (Nevers), *Le Travailleur de l'Yonne, Le Cri Populaire* (Bordeaux), *Le Progrès* (Loire-et-Cher), etc. In Paris, an illustrated satirical weekly, *Le Canard Enchaîné,* designed by H. R. Gassier; *Le Droit des Peuples,* half Belgian, half French, published by E. Grenier. A monthly review, *L'Avenir,* edited by J. B. Séverac, has taken the place of *La Revue Socialiste*

and *Le Mouvement Socialiste* that the war caused to disappear. Two other monthly reviews, *La Clairière* and *L'Action Internationale,* published in Paris, represent a kind of Socialism tinted, the first with Syndicalism and the latter with Anarchism.

The list shows the activity of the Socialists' propaganda by means of papers. During the war it was the best way they had of spreading their opinions and criticizing the "capitalistic" policy. During the two first years of the war some Socialist groups as well as individuals resorted to clandestine leaflets and pamphlets, posting them as letters to escape censorship.

STRENGTH OF THE PARTY

IT would be an error to judge of the strength of the Socialist Party by its 34,000 adherents, about 3/2000 of the French population above eighteen years of age. It is not in our French habits to form political groups and pay subscriptions. Those who do so are only those who care for public matters and are conscious that their personal welfare depends on the welfare of the collectivity. More often the Frenchman is satisfied to express his own clear political and social opinions individually in conversation and at election time, but he does not take the trouble of joining one or several groups.

The number of votes gathered by the Socialist Deputies at the legislative elections show then with more truth the strength of the different political opinions. The last elections took place in 1914 and the candidates of the party gathered more than a million suffrages. And the voters were men only of twenty-one years of age and above. At that time the Socialist Party represented therefore in reality about a sixth of the French nation, for even if women were called to vote, the relation between the parties would not be greatly modified.

In January, 1905, the different Socialist organizations of France that had existed for years became merged in one group, commonly called the *"Parti Unifié."* They were

really absorbed in the party, with the exception however of the Parti Ouvrier Français (P. O. F.), whose principal leaders then were Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue. For that reason the P. O. F. was often called the "Guesdist" Party. Its well-trained adherents obeyed strictly their leaders, who were much influenced by the German Social Democrats. They borrowed their inflated and revolutionary vocabulary and phraseology, while their action and policy were quite different. The "guesdism" was in fact a state of mind that still lasted after the unification of the party.

At that time Jean Jaurès—a political genius of a high encyclopedic culture, great orator, simple and hearty in his ways—was still alive. He had tremendous influence among all the Socialists. His great erudition, straightforwardness, kindness and sincerity placed him at the head of the Socialist Party, and he gathered all the Socialists round him, except those belonging to the Guesdist faction. He knew that in a party founded on democratic principles a leader must never break from the popular masses, but must always be in touch with them, were it sometimes necessary to follow them and alter the policy that he thought right. He knew this and he practised it. That is why Jaurès tended more and more to the left of the party. The latter existed before the war: it was a group of young men with a few older ones, the "Syndicalists," who were anxious that the party should agree with the C. G. T. (Confédération Générale du Travail). The leaders of this latter group were Pierre Dormoy, who became Conseiller Général de la Seine; Gaston Lévy, Ernest Lafont, Deputy of the Loire, and the writer of this article.

EFFECT OF JAURES' ASSASSINATION

ON the eve of the invasion of French soil by the Germans, Jaurès was murdered. His death deprived France of a political genius who would certainly have played a very important part in the tragedy of the world-war. It deprived French Socialism of the man most influential in it and who predominated over all the other leaders. The leaders that

were left were intelligent and active, but not first-rate men. They were Pierre Renaudel, Albert Thomas, Marcel Sembat, Jean Longuet, Pressemane, Paul Mistral, Alexandre Varenne, etc. I do not mention Edouard Vaillant or Jules Guesde, the veterans of French Socialism, and the protagonists of the first hour. Old age was weakening their power. One of them, E. Vaillant, even died during the war.

Among the remaining leaders none was great enough to set himself over the others. The party then found itself a prey to contests for leadership and antagonistic clans.

THE WAR BRINGS ABOUT A "UNION SACREE"

FRENCH reverses at the beginning of the war had an influence on the Socialist masses as well as on their leaders. They were thus led to accept the *"Union Sacrée,"* namely, the cessation of political strife between adverse parties. From the *Union Sacrée* the policy of class co-operation was to derive. It was openly practised when the French government counted at first two, and then three Socialist Ministers: MM. Marcel Sembat and Jules Guesde, M. Albert Thomas.

In agreement with the organization of the party, none of its members may be a Minister without the authorization of the party represented by a Congress or, failing the latter, the Commission Administrative Permanente. But considering the circumstances of the war (mobilization, "état de siège," partial occupation of French soil), a Congress was impossible. The C. A. P. should then appoint the members of the Ministry of Coalition. Such a democratic system had its drawbacks in the eyes of some individuals, for the party might delegate as Ministers men who would fail to please the President of the Republic because unbendable and thoroughly socialistic.

PRESIDENT POINCARE'S POLITICAL SKILL

THIS danger was avoided with the greatest ability in the following manner: M. Raymond Poincaré sent for his colleague of the Court of Justice, M. Marcel Sembat, a

wealthy barrister like himself, and explained to him the necessity of a Ministry of Coalition, while he offered two ministerial seats to the Socialists, one for M. Sembat himself, and the other for another Socialist. M. Sembat immediately assented to the combination. And, with his great suppleness of mind and his excellent qualities of Parliamentary manoeuvre, he immediately thought of Jules Guesde for the other seat. This was very clever because it prevented the Guesdist clan from opposing a Ministry of Coalition, that clan which was, according to the phraseology so dear to Germany, the ardent protagonist of class-strife, and the fierce adversary of class co-operation. Did M. Sembat entertain the President with this? I do not know, but it is probable. Howbeit, he disclosed the situation without delay to what remained of the C. A. P. and exposed the wish and offer of the President. He naturally supported but weakly the idea of a Cabinet of Coalition, but laid stress on the gravity of the situation, and then glided over the offer he had received of a seat. But noticing protest on the faces of a few members, he added that the President had also thought of Jules Guesde. From that moment every possible opposition disappeared, and MM. J. Guesde and Marcel Sembat were allowed to enter the Cabinet. M. Raymond Poincaré's tactics had succeeded. Later on M. Albert Thomas also entered the Ministry, but he was called there by reason of the great activity he had displayed in organizing the munitions industry during the war.

SOCIALISTS IN THE CABINET

THE policy of the government was such that no one could have guessed that there were Socialists among the members of the Cabinet. Instead of exerting their influence to make the government act in democratic way, they let the various governments of which they were members exercise a conservative policy, less liberal than that of the English governments. It was so because M. J. Guesde was old and ill, had lost his energy, and M. Marcel Sembat looked on events more as an artist and dilettante than as a man of action

and a thinker. How different the situation would have been if Jaurès had been alive!

The democratic and socialistic spirit appeared a little in the Cabinet with M. Albert Thomas. Young and energetic, highly cultivated—he took his degree in the Ecole Normale Supérieure—extremely active, M. Albert Thomas' work was enormous and excellent in his Ministry of Armaments. But it was only after a certain time that he was able to exercise any influence over the general policy. To him we owe the answer of the Entente to the questions asked by President Wilson in December, 1916.

The presence of Socialists in the Cabinet had given to the mass of the people the impression that something was altered in French politics. It was therefore a great disappointment to see that such was not the case. Displeasure grew and spread among both mobilized and unmobilized workers. It led some members of the C. G. T. and some Socialists to go to Zimmerwald in September, 1915. It is then that the group of the " minoritaires " first appeared and afterwards gradually developed in the course of the long war, under the pressure of circumstances. The dissatisfaction was great to see the leaders rule the party in an autocratic way without the bulk of the Socialists being able to know the reasons of the apparent apathy of its Socialist Ministers. The people were complaining over the rupture of international relations and the silence of the Allied governments regarding war aims.

As I said in my book, " Lessons of the World War ":

> " The circumstances created by the war were revolutionary and a revolutionary spirit sprang up in the mass of the proletariat, asking only to be set in motion by the attitude and the actions of the leaders. But nothing came of it. The admirable human material ready to hand was not utilized. Not one of the Socialist leaders understood, or dared to understand that the situation was truly revolutionary and that revolutionary means necessarily matched a revolutionary situation."

Because of the long duration of the war, and in consequence of the conditions just enumerated, the " Minoritaires "

group gradually grew in number until it became the majority at the National Council of July, 1918, confirmed by the Congress of October, 1918. In the course of this development the " Majoritaires " had been forced to yield ground, as for instance after the return from Russia of two deputies, MM. Marcel Cachin and Marius Moutet, who were quite enthusiastic over the Russian revolution. But if the greater number of the Majoritaires were accentuating their policy toward the left, a small minority tended to lean on the right. It is thus that some intellectuals had formerly made a group, the " Comité Socialiste pour la Paix du Droit." In the same way, 40 Socialist deputies had issued a manifesto at the beginning of 1918 and published a daily paper, *La France Libre,* that was more nationalistic than socialistic.

SOME SOCIALIST LEADERS

ON the eve of the October Congress the Socialist party was divided in different groups. From the extreme right to the extreme left we have first the " Forty," then the " Majoritaires," the " Centrists," the " Minoritaires," and at the extreme left the " Kienthal " section.

The Forty are a staff of deputies without any troops. Their principal leaders are MM. Compère Morel, Alexandre Varenne, Adrien Véber. These men, who are good speakers, active, of an average intelligence, have no authority whatever on the Socialist masses; there is even a certain suspicion regarding MM. Compère Morel and Varenne, who are commonly regarded as " très embourgeoisés " and " très arrivistes."

The Majoritaires had the direction of the party until the last Congress, with men like Albert Thomas, Pierre Renaudel, Bracke, Louis Dubreuil, etc. Besides M. Albert Thomas, the most remarkable leader of this group is evidently Pierre Renaudel. His physical appearance immediately shows his natural strength, for he is tall, rather stout and massive, his brow broad, though somewhat receding. In intelligence he has not the amplitude that Jaurès had, whose disciple and imitator he is. But he has sufficient qualities to become one

of the best if not the best leader of the party. To attain this end, he should however get rid of the influences that sway him, and the narrow views he, too, holds. He is an orator whom the masses listen to. He is bold and able to impress himself upon his hearers, and he is besides very often a clever political tactician, perhaps even too clever sometimes—a heritage from his Norman origin. Being a veterinary surgeon by profession, his culture is far from being as developed as that of Jaurès or Albert Thomas, but as he is an active worker, he has considerably added to his knowledge, while remaining a man "of the people," a valuable asset.

The Centrists form a group with, so far, but few adherents. They wanted to prevent scissions occurring in Councils and Congresses so that the party would always be united in its opposition to capitalism. Their intention was good, but to realize it they should have had other men than those who set themselves as leaders, not at the beginning, but during 1918. When the group was first formed, in 1916-1917, the leaders were MM. Auriol, Bedouce, Ernest Lafont, a deputy. Later on MM. Marcel Sembat, Marcel Cachin and others joined this section. The first place was taken by M. Sembat who slowly and skillfully turned to the Minoritaires in order to regain his popularity, lost when a minister. M. Marcel Cachin is a Breton, born among the lower class. After having studied hard, he got some university degrees, but he began his political career early as a Socialist of the Guesdist section. He met with success, for he speaks easily and convincingly though his speech is too phraseological. At the last Congress, M. Bracke, a university professor and a remarkable Greek scholar, called to him, during an interruption: "Humbug!" The epithet is somewhat sharp. Does it express the truth? It would be hazardous to say, but it must be noticed that the variations of Marcel Cachin's policy and speeches seem to give some ground to Bracke's appreciation. After the Congress of October, M. Marcel Cachin became the editor of *L'Humanité*. His editorials are far from equaling those of M. Renaudel. The Centrist group possesses a man of very fine intellect and

great culture, M. Ernest Lafont, a barrister. Still young he is only beginning his political career.

THE NEO-MAJORITAIRES

THE Minoritaires are no longer the minority. They have become the majority and are now known as the "Neo-Majoritaires." Their leaders are numerous, and include deputies and others, but none of them is above the average. In this, they are like the leaders of the other sections. They are: M. Jean Longuet, a barrister, who hardly ever speaks in the Chamber, of which he is a member; he is a grandson of Karl Marx and the son of an old "Communard," Charles Longuet. His relation to Karl Marx is one of his greatest cards in the part he plays in the party to which his average intellect scarcely fitted him. M. Mistral, formerly a merchant of Grenoble; M. Mayèras, a professor whose eloquence is cutting; M. Emile Goude, an official of Marine, an active worker full of common sense; M. Valière, an intelligent man whose modesty partly annihilates him; M. Paul Faure, emphatical and passionate; L. Léon Frossard, formerly a schoolmaster dismissed because of his political opinions, afterwards a manual worker and now secretary of the party. M. Frossard is an intelligent man, his speech is clear and incisive; he is a real force. His square jaw betokens will and energy. He is ambitious and, in a few years, if the course of events is not disturbed, Léon Frossard will probably be one of the party's principal leaders.

At the October Congress the Kienthaliens made a block with the other Minoritaires, in spite of the great difference in their policies. They represent about a third of the present majority. Their leaders are MM. Loriot, Rappoport, Alexandre Blanc, Raffin-Dugens, whose intellectual values are middling.

MEDIOCRITY A GENERAL THING

AS one may judge from this rapid survey of the leaders of the party mediocrity is their general characteristic. When Jaurès lived all these men were good lieutenants un-

der his leadership. But Jaurès' death broke up this entente. Each lieutenant thought himself called to be the principal leader. This caused different clans to appear in the party. As it is easier to rule autocratically than democratically, the autocratic tendency became manifest. Men were inadequate to the situation. And this was so because no new man is allowed to appear in the party because of its growing strength and rigidity, in the course of years, through its having been organized on the model of the German social democracy. If a newcomer wishes to rise, he must belong to one of the clans and follow the regular channel.

This situation of the party makes it clear why the Congress of October, 1918, was still, more than before, a contest of persons for obtaining the places, and not a contest of opinions. No policy for the future was decided on. This is weakening a good deal the party in its action. The responsibility rests on all the sections alike. Three motions were issued, all three vague and verbose. That of the Minoritaires gathered the majority—a small one on the whole: 316 mandates out of a total of 3,000 mandates. The Majoritaire, Centrist and Minoritaire motions did not offer great differences, at least in wording. But it was difficult to divine the ideas that permeated the party, so obscure were the motions. We must, to judge of the state of mind of the whole party, compare them with the motions voted unanimously to approve President Wilson's peace policy. One may say without error that the party's wishes are for a durable and just peace, based on the free disposition of the peoples, the renewal of international relations with the other Socialist parties of the world, the revival of the Internationale, keeping as ever its aims of socialization of the means of production and goods.

The change of clans in the direction of the party has not altered its policy since August, 1914, and it will not change yet. The Neo-Majoritaires will do what the old Majoritaires did. Events draw men rapidly along and men must follow them and submit to them.

CONFLICTING CONCEPTIONS OF SOCIALISM

THIS war, as I said in my "Lessons of the World War," was a contest between two conceptions of socialism, State socialism, represented by the German Social democracy, and federalist and libertarian socialism, represented by the Franco-Belgians. The destruction of the German autocracy ensures the triumph of federalist over state socialism.

In the course of the world war, the Socialist Party is the only one that had a war policy, especially in financial and economical matters. On several occasions, the government had to apply measures proposed by the Socialists, but always some months too late. The Socialist Party is the only political party of France that did not stop its political life. If public meetings were forbidden and private meetings made difficult, men whose influence was felt politically did not remain the less active militants in the Ligue des Droits de l'Homme, the Coalition Républicaine, and economically in the co-operatives and in its relations with the C. G. T.

Somewhat handicapped though the party was, it had however the best position in the recent cataclysm, and men joined it who belonged to the Radical party, or even more to the Right. Under the pressure of circumstances the Socialist ideal has won adherents among the peasant class, the small bourgeoisie and the urban proletariat. The duration of the war has played an important part in this fact. The hate of war and militarism, expressed only by the Socialists before the war, has become general and has brought many people to the socialistic ideal. The socialistic measures adopted as regards food questions, repartition of raw stuff, transports, etc., have accustomed men to the possibility of the realization of Socialism. That is why I draw from it the assurance that the Socialists are growing in number. At the time of the elections—probably during the first six months of 1919—at municipal elections, and general councils, deputies and senators, we shall have a tangible proof of this. I presume that we shall have Socialists in the Senate, and that the number

of deputies will double, thus representing a third of the French population, if not more. The result will be that the Socialist Party will be called upon to play a more and more important part in the policy of the country.

SOCIALIST PARTY FACING A CRISIS

EVERYTHING tends to prove that the French Socialist Party is just now facing a crisis. It is being transformed, as were the Socialist parties of Denmark and Germany. Between the extreme Right and the extreme Left, the common points are so rare that a true understanding is almost impossible. It seems as if a split would be the inevitable result. Logically the party ought to divide into three sections: a central section, the most important one, including the Neo-Majoritaires and the Neo-Minoritaires, and the two other sections would be the Kienthaliens and "Forty." It may be that owing to the zeal of the leader, the division will take place in the center of the party, thus causing two sections to appear having each a well differentiated extreme Right and extreme Left, and causing in consequence a complete breaking up of the party. Howbeit, it seems certain that the party will divide in two or three new parties. But this will not weaken Socialism—on the contrary. The section of the extreme Right will hold, in spite of all socialistic tendencies which will influence governmental circles, while it will itself be subjected, *nolens volens,* to the influence of the Socialist Party. On the other hand, the latter will be influenced by the separate section of the extreme Left. I do not doubt that the war has given a powerful impulse to Socialism, and consequently the Socialist Party is called upon to play a still greater political part than it has ever played. I prophesy this supposing that the course of events run smoothly. But the case might be different, for financial, economical, and, generally speaking, political conditions are eminently revolutionary. If such possibilities are realized the Socialist Party and the Conféderation Générale du Travail (General Confederation of Labor) will hold the whole destiny of France in their hands.

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE —FIRST BATTLEFIELD NURSE

How Queen Victoria Awarded Her the Order of the Red Cross

By JOHN BRUCE MITCHELL

THE air trembled with the roll of the guns. Rifle fire crackled to staccato and tempoed down. The sinking sun flashed bayonets, red with work. A man groaned. Through the acrid smoke from the shells a woman came. She was dressed neatly in blue, very slender, very girlish, very pretty; some called her delicately molded face spirituelle. She knelt beside the wounded man and held his head in her arms, " You are not going to die," she whispered. . . .

The cavalry had charged. The staff had thought the enemy line breaking and launched a galloping thunderbolt to spread confusion and panic. With wild yells they had crashed down the little valley, the beat of thousands of hoofs on the battle-strewn earth. . . . Then the cavalry came back, a few of them; for some one had blundered. Riderless horses, a tangle of equipment, men drunkingly swaying in the saddles, others, their spurs caught in the stirrups, dragging like effigies—clamor, chaos, rout. The woman met them, this very young, very serious girl whose face the wounded looked upon as a saint's. She bound a trooper's wounds, " You were all so brave to go," she said. He looked up with a grin, " Thank you, miss, but we'd go again." . . . .

A great battle had been fought. They were bringing back the wounded to a base hospital—the trudging wounded with their chins on their breasts; the clinging wounded, arms around a comrade's shoulder, hopping on one foot, dragging something that used to be a leg; the " stretcher cases " inert

on a canvas strung between two poles, others that lay on the blankets very still and gave no sign of life unless to cry, "Water! Water!" They were bringing back the wounded by the thousands. They were bringing them into a great building where other men cut away their mud-caked boots, cut away whole patches of their uniforms where there were dark stains. Men, all men and misery. And then the woman came. As she directed the workers her gentle voice became imperious with commands; when she spoke to the wounded it was as if an angel had passed. One woman, thousands of men; and into that place of misery came cheerfulness. . . .

France? No. Italy? Far from it. Those things happened more than half a century ago. They happened in the Crimea. And the woman was Florence Nightingale. She did not live to see the Great War but her spirit was over there. Her presence walked with the thousands of nurses who tenderly cared for wounded men. Her spirit consciously or unconsciously influenced every woman who worked for the Red Cross, or in other ways sought to alleviate the sufferings of war. For Florence Nightingale was the first woman to carry mercy to the battlefields. After her work in the Crimean War, Queen Victoria of England presented her with a cross of red enamel; it lay in a box on a pillow of white satin—whence comes the emblem of the Red Cross. Henri Dunant, the Swiss physician to whom the Red Cross Society owes its inception, has said: "Though I am known as the founder of the Red Cross and the originator of the Convention of Geneva, it is to an Englishwoman that all the honor of that convention is due. What inspired me was the work of Miss Nightingale in the Crimea."

HER GREAT WORK

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE achieved great things. She is one of the heroines of history. In the light of her vast achievements her heroism in the Crimea is trivial. It is not that she braved the dangers of battle; thousands of women have done that. But Florence Nightingale changed the profession of nursing. Before her coming it was considered in

a more or less disreputable light; most nurses were coarse, even immoral persons; if a woman took up nursing there was placed upon her the Great Taboo. That ended with Florence Nightingale.

She introduced sanitation into the calculations of military leaders. Before her day—and the Crimean War was a shocking example of it—military leaders thought that their one concern was tactics, reserves, food and ammunition. Never a campaign but brought with it the unseeing enemy, Disease; and men dying like flies. Florence Nightingale fought for sanitation in the armies and, awakening the need for this in the military conscience, saved the world, from her day to this, millions of lives. Every clean piece of hospital linen, every scrupulously scrubbed plate, every super-sterilized surgical instrument, every cup of greaseless broth, every clean-swept corner, every carefully swept camp street, every camp kitchen free from refuse, every great can for boiling water—every device known to modern armies to keep the sick and the well free from disease is due to the pioneer work of this woman.

Nor is that all. Women in business, woman suffrage, women's rights—they are commonplace today. Not so half a century ago. Those were some of Florence Nightingale's ideals. She worked for them just as she worked to relieve sufferers. She had no patience for a career that only included a knowledge of when not to trump a partner's ace, direct the serving of a dinner, or play Mendelssohn's "Spring Song." She wanted to "do things." She knew that other women had the same ambitions, that they secretly rebelled against being kept in artificial growth in a bird-cage. She gave expression to the unspoken desires of the Englishwomen of her day, and was the first champion of women's rights.

What sort of a person was she? Nothing very startling, just like thousands of other English or American girls. Possibly her greatest asset was that she did things instead of talking about going to do them. There was that and the fact that she came to be very sure of herself that she possessed executive ability. There was nothing of the Joan of

Arc about Florence Nightingale. She did not hear any voices; nor was she divinely inspired. Much that is nonsense and balderdash has been written about her—particularly when she died. Queen Victoria expressed her quite neatly. "Such a clear head; I wish we had it in the War Office."

A BORN NURSE

THE popular conception of Florence Nightingale's career is of a girl of very good family who, moved by a wave of pity, forsook the pleasures of fashionable life for the horrors of the Crimean War, scattering on its battlefields sweet words and comfort; who retired at the close of the war to private life and lived thenceforth in the seclusion of an invalid's room, varied only by good deeds to hospitals and nurses and by gracious and sentimental pieties. But her life was built on much larger lines. She was born of an upper middle-class English family in Florence, Italy, in 1820. Her father's name was not Nightingale but Shore. The name Nightingale was a condition imposed by the inheritance of an estate. It is interesting to know that her mother was the daughter of William Smith, a member of Parliament, who advocated the emancipation of the negroes and other ideas calculated to relieve suffering in the world. Florence Nightingale grew up much in the same way as other girls. She received an excellent education, became a good musician and was facile in the use of languages. Her home was in Derbyshire at a place called Lea Hurst. It is said that when she was a girl she used to visit the cottagers there bringing dainties to those who were ill. Hers was a sympathy quick to be awakened. She became interested in hospitals, she observed that in England and on the Continent most of these institutions were in the care of Sisters of Charity. She felt that the women of the Protestant Church should also undertake work of this kind and at once began a study of it. She heard that in Germany there was already such a hospital in operation, the Fliedner Hospital at Kaiserwerth, and, when

she was twenty-nine, she took a course there. Returning to London she had a conversation with Dr. Howe of Boston, famous for his work in educating the blind. This conversation reflects the attitude of that day toward women who "did things." "Dr. Howe," said Florence Nightingale, "may I ask you to tell me upon your word whether it would be anything unsuitable or unbecoming to a young Englishwoman, if she should devote herself to works of charity in hospitals?"

"I say to you," replied Dr. Howe, "go forward, if you have a vocation for that way of life; act up to your aspiration, and you will find that there is never anything unbecoming or unladylike in doing your duty for the good of others."

Florence Nightingale, her own opinion confirmed, launched herself upon her career. By the time the Crimean War broke out, she, as a result of continuous study and training, was conversant with all that anyone could teach her in regard to nursing, diet, hospital construction and hygiene. She was active in hospital work in London when war began to rumble. In the spring of 1854 the Bear Who Walked Like a Man began to waddle down from the Russian forests toward Turkey. The Foreign policy of Britain at the time did not relish Russia seizing the Dardanelles. So Great Britain entered the war on Turkey's behalf and 25,000 soldiers were dispatched to Constantinople. The Battle of the Alma was fought and won and all London rejoiced. Then, from that out of the way part of the world, the truth began to trickle back. England was stunned to read in the papers one morning a revelation of appalling conditions in the Crimea. Russell, a famous war correspondent of his day, declared that the British War Office had been wofully lacking in hospital and sanitary planning, that there were thousands of wounded and sick lying in abominable conditions in the old Turkish barracks at Scutari without decent nursing. He ended his story with an appeal. "Are there no devoted women among us able and willing to go forth and minister to the sick and suffering soldiers of the East in the hospital at Scutari? Are none of the daughters of England at this extreme hour of need ready for such mercy work?"

ANSWERING THE CALL

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE read that appeal. She at once wrote the Minister for War offering her services. He, roused by the storm of indignation that was sweeping England, had written her. Their letters crossed in the mail. He wrote to her: "There is, so far as I know, only one person in England capable of organizing and directing such a plan, and I have been several times on the point of asking you if you would be disposed to make the attempt." Six days later Florence Nightingale, accompanied by 34 women volunteers, sailed for the Crimea. When it was proposed to give them a parade and an official farewell, she said: "I am naturally a very shy person," and with her little band she left quietly on her splendid adventure.

Florence Nightingale arrived in Turkey the very day the bloody battle of Inkerman was fought. She found, at Scutari, that great barrack hospital, the revelation of the conditions which had caused such an uproar in England. The barracks was a huge quadrangle, its corridors rising floor above floor, and had a linear extent of four miles. When Florence Nightingale took her first walk around it there were 2,300 patients—two miles of sick beds, beds foul with mud and undressed wounds. She found mattresses strewn in the corridors; the wards steamed with fever, cholera and filth. The air was heavy with gangrene. And to this great company of the sick and dying were added hour by hour the wounded from Inkerman. By nightfall of her first day in the Crimea there were 5,000 cases in the hospital—and an army of disease and filth.

But that was not all of her problem. There was the stupid, ingrown prejudice and arrogance of old-fashioned army officers. "The War Office must be crazy to send a woman down here. War is a man's job. This little slip of a girl will only be in the way. She'll probably die on our hands and then there will be an investigation and a lot of silly rot."

"Yes," a General agreed, "it will be bad for the discipline, too. These girls coming down here and pampering the

soldiers—a fine state of affairs, I say. And they expect us to win a war with petticoats around."

"A silly business," an old campaigner agreed. "If the men are going to get well, they're going to get well. If they're going to die, they're going to die." This is reflected in a letter written by an officer of that day. "Our Colonel is tickled by a saying of the mess room that 'Miss Nightingale has shaved her head to keep out vermin.' I wonder if she will wear a wig or a helmet. Women imagine that war can be made without wounds. They will be teaching us how to fight next. As for their ideas of nursing, why some of the ladies actually took to scrubbing floors. The Colonel greatly resents her capture of orderlies for mere purposes of nursing.

THE HEROINE OF THE CRIMEAN WAR

JUST after the Crimean War was over there was a dinner given in London to the officers who had served in that campaign. It was suggested that each guest write upon a slip of paper the name of the person whose services would be longest remembered. When the papers were examined each bore the name of "Florence Nightingale." What had changed the attitude of the military?

From the day that Florence Nightingale entered the great hospital at Scutari it was fired with a new intelligence. She brought pity, energy and womanly invention. She declared war on dirt. She brought into the hospital fresh air, clean linen, sweet food and soft hands. Previously the men had eaten the rough provender dished up by army cooks. Florence Nightingale organized a great kitchen to provide special food for the wounded. She caused to be built a great laundry and dirt disappeared. The stupid, crude devices of men and the brainless routine of military bureaucrats she swept into the air almost with the wave of her slender hand. She was impatient with red tape. Stores had arrived from England. Her wounded were languishing for them. Military red tape required that they could not be issued until they had been inspected. Heavy-footed officers fussed about the

stores all day; by night the work had not been completed, so they locked the doors behind them. The sick could wait. That night Florence Nightingale called for a couple of orderlies and under her direction they smashed the doors with axes and the stores were issued to the wounded that night.

Whenever the conditions in the hospital were most dangerous, whenever disease was most prevalent and death was hovering close, Florence Nightingale was there. As her slender form glided quietly along, every soldier's face softened with gratitude at the sight of her. When all the medical officers retired for the night and silence and darkness settled down upon those miles of prostrate sick, she could be seen making her solitary rounds, holding a little lamp in her hand. And there were men who in gratitude turned to kiss her shadow on their pillows as it passed. At two o'clock one morning they found her writing down the dying words of a soldier. He had committed to her his watch and trinkets, and he closed his eyes with her hand upon his brow. Night after night she walked along those four miles of sick beds, carrying the little lamp. It was that which inspired Longfellow to write "The Lady of the Lamp."

Cleaner of the Augean Stables of Scutari, Savior of thousands of lives; with her sweet, spirituelle face an exalting inspiration to thousands of rough men, she, the frail, cultured little English girl, gave her health to humanity. The terrible strain of the work in the Crimea, day after day, often twenty hours on her feet without rest, broke her down; but they called her "The soldier's friend," and she was happy. Cold statistics tell what she did in the Crimea. When she entered the hospital hell at Scutari the death rate was 42 per cent; when she left it, it was 2 per cent. Upon her return to England her health broke down. She became an invalid. Her slender little body had done all it could, but her spirit lived on, sending inspiration out into the world, stirring women to go and do likewise.

And what did Florence Nightingale say one day when she sat in her home in London, a placid old lady whose dainty lace cap fell over her silver hair in long lapels, giving a charm-

ing frame to a face singularly beautiful in old age? She said: "There can be no such thing as civilized warfare. The day must come when the killing of men by men in the name of war shall be no longer glory, but disgrace. That is the lesson, the only one worth while taught by the killing of men by men."

A LIFE

By ARLEEN HACKETT

OUT of a mist, a dream, a vague unknowing,
Into this world we come, to fight, to pray—
Striving through years, perhaps, to gain a showing,
Then through a mist, a dream, a vague unknowing,
Into a silence deep, we slip away.

THE THEATRE IN REVIEW

By C. COURTENAY SAVAGE

"Plays of Gods and Men"

DISCOVERING Lord Dunsany in 1919 should be more or less of an impossibility, yet each performance given by the Stuart Walker players emphasizes with amazing regularity the fact that Lord Dunsany's work is not known to the majority of American theatregoers. If it were, his plays would be shown more constantly and to such sizable audiences that only the biggest theatres of the country could be used to accommodate them. This would mean big stages, and Mr. Walker's art and the Dunsany dramas would profit by spacious settings and many supernumeraries.

Any lack of popularity of this author's work lies in the fact that the average theatregoer in the United States is shy of short plays. There is a mistaken theme that they belong to the amateur and not to the regular theatre, yet no three-hour drama can develop more sustained interest than "The Gods of the Mountain," and not even the Winter Garden offers more chance for the spectacular than "The Laughter of the Gods," with its ladies weeping over the lack of gold dust for their purple, blue and green hair.

After seeing his miniature dramas one might easily guess that Lord Dunsany was Irish. From the peat bogs and rocky crags of his native land have come whispers of folk-lore that must have gone deep in his heart. Kings and gods have visited him with splendor and terror, and from his own everyday world he has drawn his common folk. He has a biting sense of satire that is akin to humor. Gods and men are his topics, with the gods strangely typifying the relentless destiny that cannot be altered. While he has laid his plays in the far-away days of barbaric splendor, his situations are thoroughly modern. One realizes that, after all, men have changed but little from the time of the decadence in

Babylon. Today, as ever, we believe that we are superhuman—that we can cheat destiny. Like the gods of the mountains, Destiny seems to be only an image of jade.

Lord Dunsany's art has been fortunate in the fact that it has been introduced by a master craftsman of the theatre, Stuart Walker, who once again proves his talent. The plays are richly mounted, and splendidly cast. All the subtle spell of the Orient is present—color, incense, lighting, severe flat backgrounds of daring colors. The players reflect Mr. Walker's spirit of excellence. George Gaul, undoubtedly one of the most versatile of the younger players, proves himself of rare histrionic ability, no matter if he is the young, scheming beggar of " The Gods of the Mountains " or the old prophet of " The Laughter of the Gods." Margaret Mower, as clever as she is beautiful, lends much to the success of the play; her mad queen in " The Laughter of the Gods " could not be improved upon, for she brings out all the poetic beauty of the character. McKay Morris, Beatrice Maude, Edgar Stehli, Aldrich Bowker and Morgan Farley, all members of Mr. Walker's company for several seasons past, lend their capabilities to each play in the repertoire.

Stuart Walker and Lord Dunsany are a more than ordinarily interesting combination of dramatist and producer. What Stuart Walker might do with the Dunsany plays if a large stage were at his disposal is a joy to imagine.

Two Great Players at Their Best

MRS. FISKE'S new play, " Mis' Nelly of N'Orleans," is the story of a jilted woman returning to her home after twenty years to right the love affair of her niece and the son of the man who has jilted her. Laurence Eyre, the author, calls his play a comedy of " Moonshine, Madness and Make-Believe." It is all of that, but above all it allows one of our most capable players the opportunity to offer a characterization that must stand with her best work. The play has little real suspense, just enough to carry the audience through three acts of acquaintanceship with some delightful dwellers

of the old New Orleans French *quartier*. Many of their actions, when regarded from the light of a cold Northern view, are quite "mad"—but they are amusing and offer some slangy dialect of the Creole that might find its way into our vocabulary, judging from the way the audience repeats the odd phrases used in the play. Of course, the ending is happy, making it possible for Mis' Nelly to find contentment in the arms of the man who sent her heartbroken to Paris twenty years before. The whole play is Mrs. Fiske; she "makes" it as probably no other player could do. She is a perfect Creole, touched by Paris. Her humor is excellent, leaving only the memory of her scarred unhappiness. The correctness of the dialect, by the way, is vouched for by no less an authority than George W. Cable. "Mis' Nelly" as characterized by Mrs. Fiske will find a permanent place in the American theatre.

Leo Ditrichstein, appearing in his second new play of the season, is again the great lover. The new play is a comedy for the most part, with a very realistic apoplectic stroke at the final curtain as an ending for the amorous phase of the life of the *Marquis*. "The Marquis de Priola" is from the French of Henri Lavedan, its three acts laid in Paris, and its story telling of the last love affairs of the fast-aging *Marquis*. He is a merry old roué and has devoted his whole existence to a careful study of women, dividing them into psychological groups and learning how the women of each group may be thrown under his spell. As a background for the loves of the *Marquis* is the story of his ward, a young man not at all in sympathy with the gay life of Paris, who is discovered at the end of the play to be the son of the *Marquis*. The younger man's upbraiding of his father for his disgraceful conduct so enrages the old man that an apoplectic stroke follows. The acting of the play is of the Ditrichstein variety. His portrait of the *Marquis* is reminiscent of the famous work done by Mansfield in "The Parisian Romance," with the deft touch of Mr. Ditrichstein added to the love scenes. The three women who pass under his spell during the play are admirably portrayed by Jane Grey, very clever in a role requiring a touch of

comedy, Lily Cahill as the discarded wife of the *Marquis,* and Katherine Emmett as a staid type of woman who finds a cloak for her emotions, in this case, under the guise of charity work.

Admirers of Leo Ditrichstein will find him at his best in his new play.

A "Popular" Drama

TO attempt to outline the situations that make "The Woman in Room 13" the most successful play of the "popular" drama type that has been offered this season would be difficult. The situations switch quickly and with telling force, never for an instant becoming so involved as to bewilder the audience. It is a play of so-called "high life" with a mixture of the court. *Cherchez la femme* is the main theme, and as usual holds good, this time being the question, "Who is the woman in Room 13?" The triangle, or really the foursome, is given a note of originality by the excellent characterization of the other woman, and because the action of the play demands that the divorced husband of the leading woman character (a detective) is hired by the second husband to spy on the wife. It is a dramatic situation. Of course, the ending is quite satisfactory to the players and to the audience. One of the truly remarkable points of the new play is its construction—every ambitious playwright should see it, for there is not an unnecessary line or situation. The suspense is carefully built up from the first curtain, and no incidental characters are included for the sake of comedy. It approaches a culminating climax and ends with a quick and sufficient explanation. The acting is admirable. Janet Beecher plays the part of the wife in her usual good taste. Lowell Sherman is her first husband and afterwards the detective. Charles Waldron and Gail Kane play the other two principal parts, Miss Kane being very welcome back in a speaking role after her long sojourn before the ever-moving film of the camera.

Comedies

COMEDY of the most laughable type is to be found in several of the newer plays. Incidentally, bedrooms predominate as stage settings.

The funniest and quite the most risqué of the new plays is " Please Get Married," by Lewis Allen Browne and James Cullen. It tells of the honeymoon happenings of a young couple married against the wishes of the young man's father by a strange clergyman, known to the audience to be a burglar in disguise. They depart for the honeymoon and immediately after the girl's parents discover the real history of the man. Pandemonium follows—and a search. In Act II. one of the truly hilariously funny acts that too infrequently appear in farce, the young couple are discovered in the hotel bedroom. They attempt to go to bed, and regard all the interruptions in the way of frantic telegrams telling them that they are not married as practical jokes. As a climax the hotel burns. In the end they discover that they were married all the time. That fact is, of course, an anti-climax, but the humor of the audience is so high that they do not mind having been fooled. That second act, with the suggestion entirely in the minds of the audience, and the players apparently innocent of the laughter they are causing, is the winner. The acting is very good. Ernest Truax plays the part of the young husband with dignity and subtlety. He carries the lion's share of the entertainment. Edith Taliaferro is sweet and maidenly, incidentally very lovely in her *robe de nuit*. The rest of the cast is competent and plays in key with the author's script.

" Up in Mabel's Room " is another play of the month which might be left unseen by the very young. It will prove inoffensive to most theatregoers, but the plot does pivot around the possession of a lady's chemise, one given by a bridegroom to a lady of his past fancy, who, to revenge his marriage to another, threatens to show it to the bride. The result is obvious, and very funny. A company of excellent farceurs manage to keep this play from being vulgar at any

time—and always active. Hazel Dawn is *Mabel*—making her first appearance in straight comedy. She succeeds in being very clever in her most beautiful manner. Enid Markey, fresh from the films, is the bride in the case, and Walter Jones and John Cumberland, capable through long experience of obtaining the best values in any farce, are the leading male players. It's a successfully funny play, though decidedly intimate.

Another comedy—this time a most respectable one—is "Cappy Ricks," a dramatization of the Peter B. Kyne stories that have been popular in *The Saturday Evening Post*. Like most dramatizations, they are rather disappointing. The play tells one of the incidents in the life of the peppery shipping man—this time regarding a lumber deal. The characterization allows for much humor. As a foil for *Cappy Ricks* is *Matt Peasley,* from "down east," though a *Matt* made very romantic by the dramatist and Mr. Courtenay, who plays the role. The play is hardly the type that will go in the big cities but should prove more than ordinarily popular on the road. Several well-known players are featured in the cast—Tom Wise playing *Cappy Ricks,* William Courtenay, *Matt.* Helen Lowell, free from a grotesque character role, is playing *Aunt Lucy,* and wearing handsome gowns—a novelty for Miss Lowell and her admirers.

The Song and Dance

THE new musical comedies of the month are three in number, but one of them, "Just Around the Corner," in which Marie Cahill is starred, has already gone, so need not be considered.

Of the others, "The Velvet Lady," was the first to arrive. It is a somewhat disappointing renovation of Fred Jackson's amusing farce, "A Full House," with Victor Herbert music. The music is good, but not the equal of most that Mr. Herbert has produced. The story, for those who do not remember the farce, is of a young husband forced to leave his wife and get some letters belonging to a client and friend—a

mix-up in bags which brings in a burglar, a pair of comic servants—and a chorus girl. In this case the chorus girl is known as "The Velvet Lady." If there were more of her there would be more chance for the play to run, for as *Vera Vernon,* Miss Fay Mabee, of dancing fame, is quite the most attractive player in the cast. It is a good cast, too, and not the fault of the players that it does not succeed, but Georgia O'Ramey has little to do, while the same is true of Ernest Torrence as the butler.

Much more happy was the opening of "Good Morning, Judge," an English musical comedy based on Pinero's play, "The Magistrate." The story tells of a woman who, when marrying a second time, cut five years from her age, forcing her son to appear fourteen instead of nineteen. Her husband is the magistrate, and quite proud of his step-son, even when to his amazement the child takes him to one of the most notorious cabarets in all London. Of course, the wife (and mother) is there for a very good reason, and the novelty comes, not in the recognition, but in the raid, in which the magistrate and the boy escape—but the wife and her party are taken to the police court, where the husband is sitting. In the end it is the fourteen-year-old boy who straightens out the whole matter, including his own age. The play is really funny, and very well presented. Charles and Mollie King have the leading juvenile roles, with George Hassell as the magistrate. They are an enjoyable trio, and with their help "Good Morning, Judge," should have a long run.

The Editor's Un-Easy Chair

(Contributions to this department must be addressed to the Editor and should not exceed 1,000 words. Manuscripts should contain addressed envelope stamped.)

What Has Become of the Dollar?

DURING the war Mr. Average Man stood for patriotism. It was his job cheerfully to put his shoulder to the burden and rejoice. Mr. Average Man, who saw the cost of living rising, while his own pay-check stood still, set his teeth to grin and bear it, somehow managed to buy a few Liberty Bonds, and kept his little home together. Meanwhile the purchasing power of his dollar grew less and less.

It was hard, but he stood for it; like millions of other American "Mr. Britlings," he saw it through. And not a peep out of him as prices rose. "It is the war." But the war is at an end. The American "Mr. Britlings" see the purchasing power of their dollar still dwindling and protest is going up. Bolshevism? Not from "Mr. Britling." But he is uneasy.

His dollar which in 1913 could buy a dollar's worth—taking that year as standard—could at the beginning of 1919 buy less than fifty cents' worth of the family budget; 1919 found Mr. Average Man receiving a better salary than six years before, but still unable to keep abreast of the tide of advancing prices.

In the butcher shop around the corner his wife is told that roast beef costs 55 cents a pound, lamb 45 cents and pork chops 42 cents a pound. The prices the retailer paid the wholesaler on the same day were, for beef 23 to 25 cents a pound, lamb 23 cents and pork chops 25 cents. Then he reads that the Government is "investigating the packers," and a great light dawns. "Ah, the Trusts!" But the packers say a thousand-pound bullock costs them from $160 to $180; that only 650 pounds of it are edible meat, and that they receive for this from $125 to $145, and do not profit from the sale of meat but from the by-products from the animal.

The butcher and grocer and baker all tell Mr. Average

Man that their present stocks were bought or contracted for while the war was on, at "war prices," and that as soon as these stocks are sold prices will come down. But invariably the day that wholesale prices rise the retailer raises his prices, although the goods on his shelves were bought before the rise went into effect. Mr. Average Man pays either way, and he is apt to blame some of the reduced purchasing power of the dollar on his butcher, baker and candlestick-maker.

CODDLING THE FARMER

HE can blame more of it upon the coddling of the American farmer. The farmers planted seven million more acres of wheat last Autumn than they did at any previous time. It was the policy of the Government to assure the wheat supply for ourselves and our Allies, which was wise; but the Government guaranteed the American farmer $2.26 a bushel for his wheat. The wheat harvest will yield about one billion bushels, according to David F. Houston, Secretary of Agriculture, which means a billion dollars that Uncle Sam is going to have to *give* the American farmers because of the price of $2.26 a bushel that the Government guaranteed the farmer. Write it off to "profit and loss," a billion dollars, not forgetting that what is Uncle Sam's loss is Mr. Average Man's loss.

About a billion dollars is also to be written off to "profit and loss" on the shipyard extravagance. There is $100,000,000, mayhap a billion, to write off because of the scheme to check Bolshevism in Europe with free food from America. "What's the odds? We're a rich country." But Mr. Average Man is wondering what has happened to his dollar, why he can't buy more with it. We cannot eat our cake and have it too. We are in the midst of what Senator Borah calls, "a shameless orgy of expenditure." Mr. Average Man is told there will be a $600,000,000 building program for the Navy and that the Army wants to buy all the huge cantonments it used during the war. All that is giving Mr. Average Man's dollar a knock in the head. There are public men who look with fear into the future. Senator Harding says:

"We are building $3,000,000,000 worth of ships at prices necessarily contracted in the emergency of war; we are building them at from $200 to $250 per deadweight ton, and we are going on now laying keels day after day, proposing to build $2,000,000,000 more after the crisis is passed, and while we are so building the head of the United States Shipping Board is proclaiming to the world that we must write off a billion dollars—and practical shipping men say that is not enough—to permit profitable operation. Where are we going? What is to be the end? Where is the magic source in this wonderful Treasury that you can spend one, two, three, four, five billion dollars, and write it off with a sweep of the pen!"

The "magic source," of which the Senator inquires, is the dollar bill of Mr. Average Man. By the time the Government is through writing off billions to "profit and loss," the purchasing power of the dollar is due for another dwindle.

We have adopted national prohibition; write off a loss of a quarter of a billion dollars in excess revenue. Consider the loss in real-estate taxes due to the depreciation of property which housed 2,400 plants making alcoholic beverages, and 303,000 establishments selling these beverages. And who will have to make up this loss? Mr. Average Man. His dollar is bumped again.

WHY THE DOLLAR DEPRECIATES—A REMEDY

THE conditions in the business and industrial world continue to be such as to tend to further lower the purchasing power of the dollar. Roads, irrigation projects, dams, canals and other public works are planned by the Government to put the unemployed to work. Which means that in the last analysis the American people will foot the bill for it, that Mr. Average Man's dollar will be depreciated some more.

Business is in a state of uncertainty. It does not know what it may and may not do. Goods are not moving. Production is hesitating. Directly or indirectly Mr. Average

Man participates in the loss to the country that such inactivity is causing.

Theoretical economists tell us that the inability of the dollar to buy as much as it used to, is due to a vast surplus of gold in the country, which flowed here from Europe during the war. Professor Irving Fisher blames the low purchasing power of the dollar upon "too much gold" here, causing, as he says, an oversupply of currency, bringing inflation, as from the issue of worthless paper money. It is claimed by students of this school that if the weight in gold of the dollar were changed from month to month as prices rise, that the purchasing power of the dollar would be constant. Thus all our troubles would be at an end.

But, in the meantime, what is Mr. Average Man, the man on a salary, the man with the "white collar job," to do?

The Profiteers of Sensuality

WATCHING the parade during the showing of a notorious midnight cabaret in the flaming heart of the Great City, the cynic said something that was stimulating:

"Solomon's wives," he mused, "were not more glorious than these."

It was a remark that Solomon himself would have wished to hear, just as all the descendants of that great monarch today like to hear about their own beauty shows. Any night, for the price of a king's ransom, you can look at them, arrayed in all the arts of sensuality, for Solomon of Broadway displays them in his temples of sensual delight to all who enter. The Oriental lasciviousness of fancy is emphasized in these public harems. One can trace the inspiration of forbidden thought in the intricate daring of their artistic debauchery. With ignorant obedience to Solomon's hire, these young women exhibit their bodies in the sensual market places, inviting human passion to share the dissipation with wine.

The feast is prepared for no other guest but Passion, for the admission price bids the glutton defiance.

Sitting at Solomon's tables, in the regal splendor of his sensual taste, in the immobile light of intoxicated senses, Passion sees passing before his stimulated vision a panorama of beauty that is Youth, vulgarized by display. To every cunning device of stage lights, of clinging draperies, of transparent veils, of all known arts to display the beauty of young flesh, Solomon's wives submit. Some are called show-girls because they have such shapely bodies, others are called " ponies " because they have such beautiful miniature bodies, others are called dancers because their limbs are nude and agile, others are called singers because of the sensuality of the words they sing.

Out upon a raised platform that runs to the edge of the tables, exposed to the glare of calcium lights that search out their bodies through the silken web in which they are enmeshed, they proudly strut. Not meekly, as those white women who centuries ago were sold in slavery to dark-skinned men, but frankly bidding, for the glory of flesh, that belongs to the wives of Solomon, the king of sensual dreams. Solomon knows their value; his market is the highest priced cabaret in the world. He never sells them; he leases them for a season, sublets their fleshly beauty at exorbitant rates for an hour or so, to the rapacious eyes of the race of Tarquin, and keeps them for himself and his kind.

What Solomon does with his wives does not concern us, nor why they display themselves for him, but it is with Solomon's obvious debauchery of purpose and his profiteering in their sensual display that we take issue.

The fame of Solomon's entertainments has spread over the land, and the wives of Solomon are not all in one place. The kith and kin of modern Solomons, seeing the profit in young flesh, have adopted the plan of syndicating such fare for the sensual. It is an expensive fare. Five dollars for a seat, a dollar for a cocktail, two dollars for a sandwich, seventeen dollars for a bottle of wine—the price varies with the time and place—all to see Solomon's wives. They are elsewhere, these temples of delight, in large cities, but nowhere so prolific or in magnificent defiance to conventionality as in New

York, for the modern Solomon, bred in the theatre underworld, the racetrack, or the gambling house, and of varying nationality, reigns supreme over them all.

With his accession to the kingdom of white flesh he has exerted a diabolic influence, for he has greatly increased his sensual sway by his supreme taste for sensuality. Those of Solomon's tribes who have failed to accept their chances for profit in sensuality alone are not financially so successful. There is a royal discrimination against the spiritual forces of life that Solomon has decreed in his own kingdom of pleasure.

He has smeared New York with his dirty thumb-marks till the morals of New York are held responsible for his sensual appeal. This is a protest against the tribe and kind of Broadway Solomons and all their fleshly wives, who display themselves in semi-theatres and cabarets of French flavor, because they are not typical of real New York. They are, in fact, ostracized in New York, save in their own circle of commercial sensuality. Their show-places are smothered in the oils and perfumes of sickening desire and their profits are extortionate of the baser thoughts of men.

With the skill of their flesh-ridden tribe they have contrived to entice the flesh-hunters with wine.

It requires no particular acumen to trace the surprising shift of national feeling towards Prohibition when we consider the temptation, released by wine, of the modern Solomon and his wives. Prohibition is the protest of a national revolt against the sensual profiteering as much as anything else.

Of course, Solomon has his defence. He smiles, while his red lips turn white and his small eyes snap fire, as he sees the men from everywhere but New York crowding about the orgy of flesh he supplies. His patronage and his profits are his defence. With Prohibition in force, however, Solomon and his wives will have to find other pastures green, where they can pursue their sensual profiteering. With Prohibition in force, Solomon's present patrons will still come to New York to transact their business, but they will find that the old days of sensual entertainment have passed into oblivion.